THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC

QUARTERLY REVIEW

"Contributors to the QUARTERLY will be allowed all proper freedom in the expression of their thoughts outside the domain of defined doctrines, the REVIEW not holding itself responsible for the individual opinions of its contributors."

(Extract from Salutatory, July, 1890.)

VOL. XXV.—JULY, 1900—No. 99.

PENITENTIAL DISCIPLINE IN THE EARLY CHURCH.

AFTER the Eucharistic celebration in its various forms and developments nothing has occupied through Christian ages a more important place in the external life of the Church than the Discipline of Penance. To be reconciled to God and admitted afresh to the hope of heaven was, naturally, the greatest concern of sinners alive to their condition, while it was that of the Church to secure to them as fully and effectively as possible so essential a benefit. Her action in this regard is interesting to observe at every period; it is particularly so in the first ages of her existence, when her doctrines were being evolved and her discipline was still in course of formation. Hence the close attention with which writers of Church history and students of dogmatic theology are wont to examine the principles enunciated and the practices followed in these early times. Since the beginning of the seventeenth century large tomes have been devoted to describing and discussing them,[1] and the results which have been reached are briefly set forth in our manuals of Church

[1] We may mention among others Sirmundus, S. J., "Historia Pœnitentiæ Publicæ;" Petavius, "Animadvers. in S. Ephiphan.;" Dom Martene, "De Antiquis Ecclesiæ Ritibus," but above all the Oratorian Joan. Morinus, "Commentarius Historicus de Administratione Sacramenti Pœnitentiæ" (1682); Dom Chardon "Histoire des Sacraments," chiefly a summary, clear and interesting, of Morinus' great work, to be found in vol. xxi. of Mignes' "Cursus Completus Theologiæ." Among recent writers we may mention Dr. Funk, professor of history in the University of Tubingen, especially in his article in the "Kirchenlexicon."

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1899, by Benjamin H. Whittaker, in the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington, D. C.

history and theology. But a consecutive study of the subject down to the present day remained to be carried out and it has been undertaken at length, not by a Catholic theologian or cleric, but by a non-Catholic and a layman.

I.

It is now nearly four years since Henry Charles Lea, LL. D., of Philadelphia, published in three large volumes "A History of Auricular Confession and Indulgences in the Latin Church." The work contains much more than its title suggests; in fact, it comprises a historical presentation of the whole penitential system which prevailed from the beginning down to the present day, with an attempt to describe its working and to determine its ultimate consequences. The names of "Auricular Confession" and "Indulgences" were doubtless selected for the title as being more likely to catch the public ear, although anything like popular success would seem to have been entirely absent from the mind of the writer. Such an end he might easily have reached with one-tenth of the materials accumulated in his volumes and of the labor bestowed upon them. But Dr. Lea is evidently above all things a scholar. He reads and he writes chiefly for his own satisfaction. He is deeply interested in the history of the Catholic Church, and loves to go back to the sources in order to study the nature and working of her institutions. Having satisfied himself as to their real character and value, he proceeds to impart to those who are interested in them the curious facts he has come across and the conclusions they have suggested to him; the whole with a multiplicity of quotations and an absence of rhetoric equally welcome to the student and uninviting to the general reader. It is in this way that, besides some earlier historical studies, he has given to the public in succession "A History of Religious Celibacy," "A History of the Inquisition" and, last of all, the history of penitential discipline with which we are presently concerned. The two former works awakened a certain amount of interest and reached a second edition. The last, appealing to a much more limited class of readers, seems to have attracted less notice. Few reviews, so far as we know, have discussed its contents; yet to our mind Dr. Lea's most recent work is by far the most valuable of the three. Not only is its subject the most important, but it must have cost the writer incomparably more labor and research.

The "History of Auricular Confession" is visibly the product of a scholarly mind working for years amid a rich and rare collection of

theological books. One is amazed at the number of authorities to which the writer appeals at each step. Every page has its abundant footnotes of references and quotations. Fathers, Popes, Councils, historians, theologians are called up in evidence on each detail, and with an accuracy of quotation which the present writer has never found at fault. In short, by the wealth of his erudition as well as by the evident love of his work, Dr. Lea forcibly reminds one of those great Benedictine scholars of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries to whose untiring industry subsequent generations owe so much. Unhappily there have been wanting in him some of those qualities which enabled these learned men to give abiding value to their worth and weight to their judgment; in particular, special learning, thoroughness and an open mind.

Special work demands special preparatory training, and, first of all, a thorough knowledge of the sciences implied in the subject under consideration. A geologist, for example, needs to be familiar with the various forms of living nature. An astronomer requires a knowledge of physics and mathematics. No man who is not a lawyer will attempt to write a general history of criminal law; only a soldier will undertake to describe the gradual transformation of military tactics. In the same way, to write a history of the discipline of penance in the Catholic Church, it takes not only a scholar acquainted with the sources of Church history, but also a professional theologian, or at least one perfectly familiar with the doctrines of the Church which always underlie her discipline and can alone give a key to it. Short of this, the most learned of men, with all the facts at his fingers' ends, is sure to lose himself.

And this is just what happens to Dr. Lea in his "History of Auricular Confession." He knows the facts; he is not unacquainted with the doctrines of the Catholic Church, but he knows them only in an abstract, external, incomplete way. Points familiar to every enlightened Catholic escape him. He cites as peculiar to a writer what is admitted by all; he is surprised and shocked at what, properly understood, is but natural and simple. We are told of the great French historian, Thiers, that he succeeded in giving his wonderfully clear and vivid descriptions of battles and campaigns by constantly associating with military men. How often while reading Dr. Lea's history have we regretted, for his own sake and that of his readers, that instead of getting information on Catholic subjects from books only, he did not choose to consult occasionally some living authority. A few conversations with a Catholic theologian would have sufficed to preserve him from a number of mistaken

conceptions which mislead his uninitiated readers and detract considerably from the value of his work. They would also have undoubtedly led him to treat his subject more thoroughly.

For a vast accumulation of quotations and facts does not suffice to give thoroughness to a work. It requires, besides, a close comparative study of them in order to determine their meaning as well as a clear statement and discussion of the position and proofs of those who hold opposite views. Dr. Lea, it is true, tells us in his preface that he has sought to write a history, not a polemical treatise. But in this he has attempted more, perhaps, than was possible in dealing with such a subject. Some definite construction had to be put on the evidence, taken as a whole, and in the one chosen by Dr. Lea he antagonizes from beginning to end the claims and beliefs of the Catholic Church. Yet nowhere can the reader find the latter fully and candidly stated, while the proofs upon which they rest are either conveniently ignored or treated with a freedom and ease unworthy of a serious writer.

Thus, for example, the power of the Church to forgive sins in the tribunal of penance is chiefly based on the words of the Risen Saviour: *Whose sins you forgive they shall be forgiven*, etc. (John xx., 22). What meaning does Dr. Lea attach to these words? How does he account for the special solemnity with which Christ chose to surround them? How can he explain the fact that all the churches, so independent of each other in these early times, so different and often so divided, yet all believed in appealing to the power of the keys in order to obtain the remission of sin, and that they have persevered in the practice down to the present day? He quotes the words of Christ, but does not stop to inquire what they may mean; he admits the facts, but he makes no serious attempt to account for them. Surely the free use of the term sacerdotalism is no sufficient explanation, and yet Dr. Lea supplies no other. If the power of the Church over sin shows itself faintly at an early date, it is "the beginning of sacerdotalism;" if, later on, it reveals itself more distinctly, it is "the growth of sacerdotalism;" if, finally, it becomes the undeniable belief and practice of the whole Christian world, it is "the triumph of sacerdotalism." And that is all.

The truth is that Mr. Lea, while loth to be unjust to the Catholic Church, and striving sometimes to be fair, yet lacks that openness of mind, still more that sympathy which we are told a historian needs to understand and to describe properly individuals or institutions. At no time, if we may judge by his previous writings, has he had love or leaning for the Catholic Church. All he could see in

her was a human institution, born of a false conception of Christ's teachings, sustained chiefly by ambition, and flourishing at the expense of human ignorance and weakness. Entering in such a frame of mind on the study of the Church's penitential discipline, we must not be surprised that he misunderstood so completely its meaning and misinterpreted so many of its facts. Putting together his various statements, we are led to this conception: that Christ never gave the Church the power of forgiving sins; that such a power was not thought of at all in the beginning; that the discipline of penitence and reconciliation practised by the Church was purely external; that in these early times she merely exacted signs of sorrow and practices of atonement from the sinner, solemnly prayed for him, and finally, when she deemed him sufficiently repentant, readmitted him to communion. That was all. Only later on, with the growing influence of ecclesiastical authority, did the belief of a mysterious power over the guilty soul arise and spread, until it finally became one of the distinctive doctrines of the Catholic Church.

To substantiate this position no formal demonstration is attempted; but proofs are suggested right through the work, chiefly, as is natural, of a negative kind, the position of Dr. Lea being mainly a denial of the claims of Catholic theology. All the same he never fails to quote positive testimonies or facts which seem to run counter to Catholic belief. Yet we know that on the one hand silence is no evidence unless in circumstances in which a writer must have spoken had he known, and on the other hand, that his mind, when he does speak, should not be gathered from a stray sentence, ambiguous or, it may be, unaccompanied by limitations which the reader, especially if he be a contemporary, is supposed to supply. Such are the canons of intrepretation universally admitted, yet Dr. Lea shows a constant disregard for them. In the present paper there is no room for particulars; but if the reader wishes to see our historian's methods set forth in detail he need only turn to the able discussion of them by Rev. P. H. Casey, S. J. ("Notes on a History of Auricular Confession"—McVey, Philadelphia), in which the learned professor, though confining himself to the dissection of a single chapter, gives a key to the prevailing methods of the whole book and enables to judge of its argumentative value. There are times when one would be strongly tempted to question the good faith of the writer; but it is pleasanter to think that he is only prejudiced and unfriendly. After all, it happens to him only what happens to men of undoubted honesty when they start on a study, having made up their minds beforehand as to what it is to lead them to. They go along noticing

all that makes for their beliefs, leading them unconsciously into what is vague or ambiguous, overlooking or putting the most unnatural construction upon what seems to contradict them. What else can they do, unless they are prepared to relinquish their original position, to which they may feel constrained to hold on? Theologians, anyhow, should be among the last to claim that such methods imply a lack of good faith.

In reality, the whole question, studied in its sources, is far less clear and satisfactory than in our manuals of theology. Few questions, indeed, in Christian antiquity are more confused and entangled than the doctrine and practice of penance. Nor shall we find anything strange in this if we consider the extreme complexity of a process in which God, the Church and the repentant sinner have all an important share, and, at the same time, the varying character of the discipline through many ages. To one or the other of these two causes may be assigned most of the obscurities and discrepancies, apparent or real, which we meet in the statement of fact or doctrine which came down to us on the subject from the first four or five centuries. Thus at one time we are told that the Church forgives sin, at another that God, being the offended one, alone forgives, or again that guilt is washed out by the tears of the sinner. We may add that the vocabulary remains long imperfect, the same term being employed to signify things not perhaps entirely unlike or having nothing in common, yet striking us chiefly by their differences. Thus such familiar and constantly recurring words as *Penance, Reconciliation, Communion, Confession, Forgiveness, Peace*, etc., have a variety of meanings unsuspected by the ordinary modern reader and not easily determined in many cases by the student. Amid all this nothing is easier than to lose oneself, or, if one is so minded, to find materials for building up the most opposite theories. Even Catholic theologians, with the clue of traditional doctrines to guide them, are far, as we shall see, from putting the same construction on many particulars, and in the points in which they are in agreement they find a striking contrast between the ancient methods and the familiar aspects of the institution as it is applied in our day.

A rapid sketch of the discipline, such as our space will allow, will not be out of place here, especially as it will allow us to show, as we proceed, the weakness of Dr. Lea's positions, and at the same time to throw some light on the historical difficulties that still cling to the subject.

II.

Already before the coming of Christ, indeed from the beginning

of the world and through the whole history of the chosen people, God showed Himself "compassionate, merciful, ready to forgive," but always on condition of genuine repentance, shown principally by a change of life and by works of self-humiliation and atonement. Now it is remarkable that in the earliest references to the subject in the new dispensation nothing else is mentioned. St. Clement in his Epistle to the Corinthians (ch. vii. and viii.) brings together the promises of the Old Testament to encourage the sinner by the great fact that "from generation to generation the Lord has granted a place of repentance to all such as would be converted to Him." In the "Didache," or Doctrine of the Apostles, belonging, as many think, to the close of the first century, repentance is also referred to as the remedy of sin. All through the "Pastor" of Hermas (A. D. 150) nothing but repentance is spoken of, so that if we were entirely dependent on these early documents, we should be led to believe that no new methods or conditions of forgiveness had been introduced under the Gospel. Even fifty years later Tertullian, though dealing expressly with the subject in his short treatise, *De Pœnitentia*, gives little additional information. For him, too, repentance is almost everything. Already, he says, in baptism it is a necessary condition of forgiveness. But this sacrament for which it prepares should mark the end of a guilty life. Yet there are those who fall again; some into sins of deed, others into sins of thought or desire. Both need a remedy, and it is found once more, but only once, in penance or repentance. Tertullian mentions this "second plank" with reluctance, lest it become an encouragement to fresh sins. He describes the process as an acknowledgment of guilt made to God, like that of the prodigal son to his father, and represents the repentant sinner as wearing a penitential garb, fasting, praying, casting himself at the feet of priests and pious people to solicit their intercession. He exhorts the sinner to conquer his pride, and since shame has not kept him from sin, not to let shame keep him from acknowledging and expiating it. Neither should he be deterred by the hardships of the penitential life, for men are ready to face worse to secure temporal advantages, and no sacrifice is too great to escape the torments of hell.

The discourse of Tertullian is not a didactic treatise; it is an exhortation; therefore many particulars may have been omitted as not bearing on the object of the writer, or as sure to be supplied by his readers. Indeed, we have in it a clear suggestion of something more than what we might call the natural course of atonement. The process has to be gone through publicly, and it can be availed of

but once, both which circumstances point to a positive discipline already established and enforced in the Church.

What that discipline was we learn more in detail from the ecclesiastical writers who follow next in order of date, Origen and St. Cyprian; after whom all the essential features of penance stand out with growing distinction, such as we find them in the Catholic Church at the present day.

At every step we are confronted with the conviction that private repentance, however deep and sincere, does not suffice to do away with grievous sin, even though secret; that forgiveness is secured only by acknowledging one's guilt to the Church, by submitting to her treatment, severe but salutary, and by receiving finally at her hands reconciliation and peace, of which the supreme and final pledge consisted in admission to the Eucharist. In a word, we have Confession, Satisfaction and Absolution; and all the testimonies collected by Dr. Lea cannot obscure this great fundamental fact.

But they bring out forcibly that other fact already felt in the schools of theology, that much obscurity still surrounds the particulars of the institution as practised in the early period of its history.

As regards its first element, some sort of confession seems to have been a common practice among the faithful from the very beginning. St. James, after referring to the anointing of the sick (v. 13), adds the recommendation: *Confess therefore your sins one to another, and pray one for another that you may be saved.*

St. John, too (I. John i., 9), speaks of confession, but although one would like to see in his words an allusion to the sacrament, it cannot be shown that he means anything more than an acknowledgment of one's guilt before God. The "Didache" (ch. lv.) is much more explicit. "In the church thou shalt confess thy transgressions and shall not come forward for thy prayer with an evil conscience." And again (ch. xiv.): "On the Lord's day do ye assemble and break bread and give thanks, after confessing your transgressions in order that your sacrifice may be pure." Here we see confession resorted to as a purifying process, but no mention being made of a penance imposed or priestly prayer of forgiveness uttered, we can hardly suppose that the practice possessed a sacramental character, and must only see in it a custom, similar to that of religious in chapter, and for the same purposes of purification and salutary self-abasement.

But when we come to Origen, St. Cyprian and those who follow, the case is clear. We are in presence of a necessary avowal, relieving the soul, as the removal of undigested food or corrupted matter relieves the body; to be made, furthermore, not to God only, but to

those who preside in the Church (Orig. in Psalm xxxvii.). In his commentary on St. Luke xvii. Origen is still more explicit. "If we reveal our sins not only to God, but also to those that can cure them, they will be blotted out by Him who saith: *Whose sins ye forgive*, etc." And on Numbers x.: "They who feel their wounds go to the priest to be healed. . . . He becomes holy who appeals to the bishop for the remission of his sin."

Testimonies of a similar kind abound in the treatise of St. Cyprian, *De Lapsis*, in the two books *De Pœnitentia* of St. Ambrose and many other writings of the fourth century, all familiar to the student of theology. We will confine ourselves to recalling the sermon of St. Augustine (*serm.* 351), in which the whole process of recovery from sin as understood in his time is so clearly set forth that it cannot fail to interest the reader.

There are three kinds of penance, he says, one which prepares the soul for baptism, another which blots out our daily faults, a third to be practised by those who have fallen into sins that exclude from the kingdom of heaven. In regard to these last the sinner has to be severe to himself if he would secure indulgence from above. Let him, then, erect a tribunal in his own soul, listen to the accusing voice of conscience and, recognizing his guilt, pronounce against himself the strict but necessary sentence of exclusion from the Body and Blood of the Lord.

But this is only the beginning. "When the sinner," continues St. Augustine, "has thus administered to himself a severe yet beneficent correction, let him turn to those who hold in their hands the keys of the Church and let him receive from them the measure of his atonement, in which account must be taken not only of what is profitable to himself, but also of what is necessary for the edification of others, so that if they have been scandalized by his offenses, they may be edified by his public expiation."

III.

It will be noticed that during all these early ages only those who were conscious of having committed grievous faults thought of appealing to the keys of the Church. Confessions of devotion were unknown. Not only saints, like Ambrose or Augustine, but all those who lived up to the essentials of the Christian law went through life purifying themselves of their daily faults by prayer and good works, and renewing their strength by the frequent reception of the Eucharist, but never thought of appealing to the power of the keys. And these for a long time formed the great majority of

the Christian community. Many were won to the faith or received baptism only after—sometimes long after reaching manhood, and they sought it only when they had resolved to lead a truly Christian life. Furthermore, their earnestness was tested by the discipline of the catechumenate, which was a sort of novitiate of the Christian profession. During that period of probation they learned to look back with horror on their past sins and to fashion themselves to the spirit and practices of the new life. When admitted at length, they were bound to avoid the occasions and occupations of life which most exposed to sin; they lived under the eyes of the clergy and of the brethren, ever ready to remind them of their obligations. In this way comparatively few fell into grievous sins. If guilty of a crime that entailed public penance, they were often slow to turn to the appointed remedy. Its severity deterred them, and so they put it off from year to year, as others put off the reception of baptism. Like baptism, public penance could be available but once, and this was an additional inducement for them to reserve it for the end. Meanwhile, unless excommunicated, they attended the celebration of the Holy Mysteries, but they abstained from communion. Some, however, yielding to human respect, feared not to approach with the rest of the faithful.[2] S. Pacian and St. Augustine refer to the fact, but declare themselves unable to prevent it, for lack of proof against those guilty of the sacrilege.

From all this it is easy to see how limited was the practice of confession in the early ages of the Church, and how natural that so little trace of it should be met in the rare and brief documents which have come down to us from the first and second centuries. There are those who would narrow it still more. In a remarkable essay suggested by Dr. Lea's work, a professor of the Catholic University of Paris, Dr. Boudinhon, proposes the view that, like many other particulars appertaining to the sacraments, our Lord may have left to the Church to determine what sins should be submitted to the power of the keys, and that as a fact for a long time only three kinds were thus submitted: idolatry, impurity and murder.[3]

It is perfectly true that the discipline of *public penance* was long confined to these three categories. On the other hand, it is difficult to discern any other form of penance during the first four centuries. Surely if secret sacramental penance was practised side by side with the other, it could not have been applied to the same sins, else the

[2] The common custom up to the fifth century, and in many places later, was that all present at the Holy Sacrifice received communion, unless positively unworthy. Those who failed to do so were naturally suspected of some grievous fault. [3] "Revue d'Hist. et. Litter Relig," July, 1897.

more rigorous discipline would have soon disappeared. But there is no question of it even in connection with less grievous sins, and hence the conjecture of the learned professor that it was but gradually and after a considerable time that these sins were submitted to the keys of the Church. But such a position can hardly be reconciled with the formal declaration of the Council of Trent (sess. xiv., Cap. v. and can. vii.) that confession of all mortal sins is a divine institution, and consequently independent of the power of the Church. At most it may be held that the law had not been everywhere thoroughly understood and practised from the beginning. Certainly the distinction between mortal and venial sins, while obvious in many cases, was far from clear in many more, especially to consciences that had been originally trained outside the influence of the Gospel. The language even of some of the Fathers and ecclesiastical writers sounds strange to our ears. Tertullian (De Pudicitia ix), though a rigorist, speaks with leniency of faults to which all are exposed, of sins of anger, striking, cursing, rash oaths, unfaithfulness to engagements, lying through shame, faults of the palate, of the ears, of the eyes. S. Pacian of Barcelona invites to public penance—the only one he seems to know—those guilty of any one of the three great crimes. "Other sins," he says, "are cured by the compensation of better works—niggardliness by liberality, slander by satisfaction, perverse ways by upright conduct," etc. ("Parœnesis ad Pœnit," ix.) Later on St. Cesarius of Arles in a sermon long attributed to St. Augustine and still printed in the appendix of his sermons (serm. 257) exhorts his hearers to do penance, not only for their grievous or capital sins, but also for those lesser faults, *minuta peccata*, which he thus describes:

"Consider that even if you are exempt from more grievous sins, the lesser ones which you think nothing of are so numerous that if all were put together your good works would scarce suffice to compensate for them. Think of all you committed since you came to the use of reason by cursing, by swearing, by false oaths, by slander and idle talk, by hatred, by anger, by envy, by evil desires, by gluttony, by sloth, by impure thoughts, by unchaste looks, by listening to improper discourses, by disregard for the poor, for the traveler, for the prisoner, by failing to reconcile enemies, by neglecting to fast on fasting days, by talking in church and failing to heed the divine office," etc.[4]

[4] Cogitemus ex quo sapere cœpimus quid pro juramentis, quid pro perjuriis, quid pro maledictis, quid pro detractionibus, quid pro odio, quid pro ira, quid pro invidia, quid pro concupiscentia mala, quid pro gula, quid pro somnolentia, quid pro sordidis cogitationibus, quid pro concupiscentia oculorum, quid pro voluptuosa delectatione aurium, quid pro ex-

Here, as in the enumeration of Tertullian, sins mortal and venial are thrown in together, and we may well imagine that such a confusion was not rare in early times, with the result that many guilty of mortal sins failed through ignorance to submit them to the keys of the Church. But it is incredible that in spite of the warnings of the Gospel and of the formal declarations of St. Paul (to say nothing of the voice of conscience), all sins not included in the three categories would have been looked upon as venial, or that the divine law in regard to them could have been generally unknown or neglected for any considerable time. Surely the faithful whose consciences were burdened with what they considered grievous sins must have appealed to the Church for forgiveness. That such was the practice already in the time of Tertullian seems to follow from the fact that, writing as a Montanist (De Pudicitia) he denies the power of forgiveness in the Church only as regards the *peccata majora*, implying thereby that it was customary to submit others also to her authority.

This, too, may be gathered from the freedom with which new sins were submitted to public penance in the fourth century. (V. Morinus, l. v., c. 31). The impression which naturally arises from the facts is that all grievous sins were submitted to the bishops in the first instance, and that their concern was to determine which among them should be expiated by the established forms of public atonement. This again seems to be the mind of St. Augustine in his sermon 351, already referred to. A guilty conscience—"sins against the decalogue"—leads the sinner to abstain from communion and to apply to the Church for the spiritual medicine by which he may be healed. The priest decides whether or not he shall join the ranks of those who do public penance. But surely if the decision is in the negative, the penitent, though guilty of grievous faults, will not be simply dismissed. Other and gentler remedies will be applied to him—exercises corrective rather than penal. It is to these, doubtless, that St. Pacian and others refer when they speak of "opposite practices—better works" as the proper atonement for the less grievous and the lighter sins. Such penances, not being determined by custom or law, were left to the judgment not of the sinner himself, but of the bishop or priest to whom he had entrusted his conscience. They were doubtless accompanied by the

asperatione pauperum, quid pro eo quod aut tarde aut difficile Christum in carcere visitavimus, quod peregrinos negligentes suscepimus, quod secundum promissionem nostram in baptismo hospitibus pedes lavare negleximus, quod infirmos tardius visitavimus, quod discordes ad concordiam non toto et integro animo revocavimus, quod Ecclesia jejunante prandere voluimus, quod in ipsa Ecclesia stantes dum sanctæ lectiones legerentur, otiosis fabulis occupati sumus, quod aut psallendo aut orando aliquoties aliud quam opporteret cogitavimus, quod in conviviis non semper quæ sancta sed aliquoties quæ sunt luxuriosa locuti sumus.

ordinary prayers by which the other sinners were admitted to reconciliation, for at no time do we find special forms for secret absolution. It is strange, we must confess, that so important a form of discipline should remain so long without special mention and emerge distinctly to view only at the beginning of the fifth century; and we can attempt to account for it only by supposing that the solemn and striking discipline of public penance, with its strict rules and settled practices, completely overshadowed the other, which was sufficiently known to all and carried out entirely between the sinner and the chosen physician of his soul.[5]

The second act of the penitential process—*the penances enjoined and practised*—might now claim to be considered. But the subject, though complex, offers little real difficulty. It is found sufficiently explained in most of our modern Church histories, and there is little that calls for comment in what Dr. Lea has to say of it. It suggests indeed many important reflections and conveys more than one useful lesson; but our space is limited and we must pass on to the third and crowning act, *the reconciliation of the sinner through the keys of the Church.*

IV.

That a certain amount of ambiguity and obscurity surrounds the practice in early times cannot be denied; that the true values of the Church's forgiving power and action were but imperfectly understood by many, and that it took a long course of ages to make it clear to all is a fact which forces itself upon whoever goes over the original testimonies. But only one who closes his eyes to them can claim, as Dr. Lea does, that at any time the act of reconciliation extended by the Church to the penitent sinner meant only peace with her and not forgiveness from God. This is not questioned as regards the later ages; but it is from the first that we find Tertullian and the fathers assimilate the cleansing effects of the penitential rite on the soul to those of baptism. What does Tertullian Montanist reproach the Bishop of Rome with? That he undertakes to forgiven even such sins as adultery. What was the claim of the Novatians refuted by St. Ambrose? That the Church could forgive lesser but not the more grievous sins, which would be absurd on the

[5] And yet St. Augustine, addressing the catechumens ("De Symbolo ad Catechum." *in fine*) formally declares that there are but three ways of obtaining forgiveness of sin—baptism, prayer and public penance. "Nolite illa committere pro quibus necesse est ut a Christi corpore separemini. Quod absit a vobis. Illi quos videtis agere pœnitentiam scelera com miserunt, aut adulteria aut aliqua facta immania. Inde agunt pœnitentiam. Nam si levia peccata eorum essent, ad hæc quotidiana oratio sufficeret. *Ergo tribus modis dimittuntur peccata in Ecclesia: in baptismate, in oratione, in humilitate majoris Pœnitentiæ.*"

face of it if applied merely to reconciliation with the Church herself. Why was St. Cyprian so much concerned that sinners should secure the benefit of reconciliation before they died? "Because," he tells us ("De Lapsis," 29), "it is only in the present that the remission made by the priest is of avail before God." Why should Pope Celestine I. regard as "impious cruelty" the denial of absolution to the dying sinner if its only effect was to reconcile him with a society to which he would soon cease to belong? Whence the eagerness of those sinners of whom St. Augustine writes, who, at the approach of the barbarians and the consequent peril of death, ardently sought to be reconciled, or at least to be admitted among the penitents? Why does he consider as heartless and unchristian the conduct of those priests who, instead of yielding to their entreaties, themselves sought safety in flight? All this points to something of supreme importance, peace, not merely with a Christian community itself in disruption, but with the society of the blessed and with God.[6]

Thus far there is no serious difficulty. Reconciliation granted by the Church always implied peace with God, provided, of course, the sinner by his dispositions was not unworthy of it. But we find other limitations in the exercise of this "power of the keys," as it is called, which are always a cause of surprise to those who come upon them for the first time, and which have given rise to much diversity of thought among modern writers.

Thus, 1. It would seem that for a time in various parts of the Church, and even in Rome, penance was positively denied to the three categories of great sinners—murderers, adulterers and apostates. The fact has been questioned as to Rome, yet various concurrent testimonies seem to substantiate it. It cannot be denied that the Council of Elvira, in Spain (vers. 305) refused the benefit of reconciliation, even at the hour of death, in a series of cases more or less comprised in the three above mentioned classes. 2. Another limitation was in regard to sinners who sought for reconciliation only when in danger of death. To such St. Cyprian refused to show indulgence, in which he was followed by the great Council of Arles (314), where it was decreed that apostates who had not sought penitence in health were to be debarred from it in sickness. 3. Perhaps the most striking restriction of all and assuredly the most universal was that which forbade sinners to be admitted to public penance more than once. "*Servis enim Dei,*" says Hermas, "*una pœnitentia.*" And Origen: "*In gravioribus criminibus semel tantum pœnitentiæ con-*

[6] See on this point F. Casey's "Notes," already referred to.

ceditur locus." S. Ambrose and St. Pacian show that the same law continued to prevail through the fourth century, and St. Augustine reëchoes it in the fifth when he tells us (Ep. 153) that even the lowest place in the church was denied to a relapsing penitent.

If we ask what gave rise to so rigid a discipline, the answer comes to us from the very writers who reveal its existence. To some the strong sayings of Our Lord (Matt. xii., 31) about certain sins being beyond forgiveness were a great source of perplexity, and the mysterious warning of St. John (I. John v., 16) and of S. Paul (Hebr. x., 26) added to the terror of the threat. Moved by these passages, Origen was led to believe that certain sins were beyond the Church's power; he even seemed to hold that only good priests could forgive the others. (De Oratione xxviii.) The Novatians eagerly grasped at the thought, but St. Ambrose (De Pœnit I., 10) is careful to explain the passages of Scripture, while the constant belief of Catholics set aside all limitations to the power of the Church.

Why then was forgiveness denied for a time to the more grievous sins? Because of the exalted opinion in which the Christian profession was held in those early times. Whoever, after having breathed the air of the Gospel through childhood and youth, or having been trained by the methods of the catechumenate to the spirit and practices of the Christian life and solemnly pledged himself to it, yet departed from it to the extent implied by these grosser crimes, was cast out as unworthy of the Christian name. Those, on the other hand, who sought to take refuge in penance only in face of death were supposed to be devoid of genuine sorrow. To admit them, besides, at the last hour, and necessarily on easy terms, would act, it was feared, as an inducement to defer their conversion to the end. Finally those who, having been admitted once to public penance and reconciliation, yielded again to their evil passions, gave rise to the suspicion that they had never been truly converted, or that they were trifling with God's justice and abusing His mercy. An additional reason for not readmitting them to reconciliation was that once reckoned among the penitents, the name and some of the burdens of the condition clung to them, like the character of baptism or confirmation, for the rest of their lives.

But this extreme rigor, however well meant and advisable, perhaps, when first enacted, proved ultimately unsuited to the requirements of the case and was gradually put aside. As early as the beginning of the third century Tertullian reproaches the Bishop of Rome with admitting adulterers to penance and reconciliation. Fifty

years later the same indulgence is extended to apostates truly repentant, in Rome, in Africa, in Egypt. The Council of Nicæa (A. D. 325) reverses the stern decrees of Elvira and orders that the sick shall also be admitted to penance and forgiveness, with the protective clause, however, that if they return to health they shall perform the full measure of the atonement. The limitation of public penance to a single application was slower to yield. St. Augustine speaks of it as still in vigor in his time; yet already the Pope, St. Siricius (A. D. 385), had decided that even relapsed penitents might be admitted to the Holy Mysteries and to communion at the hour of death. The barrier thus weakened was finally swept away in the next century under the pressure of circumstances too long to describe here.

But it will be naturally asked what was the condition, in the eyes of the Church, of those to whom she refused her ministrations? What was supposed to become of those to whom penance was denied at a certain time through life and even at the hour of death, or of those penitents who after their reconciliation relapsed into one of the greater sins? Were they looked upon as irretrievably lost? By no means. Tertullian leaves them to God, from whom they may win that forgiveness which the Church cannot (according to him) or will not grant them. St. Cyprian, while declining to show mercy to those apostates who sought forgiveness only in time of sickness is not without hope that God may forgive them, and as a consequence he continues to extend to them his paternal solicitude.[7] In like manner St. Augustine, though declaring that there is no place in the Church for the relapsed, yet insists that they must not despair of the divine mercy; but that instead of giving themselves up in despair to the enjoyments of the flesh, they should strive by the fervor of their repentance to appease the wrath of God and win back His favor. (Ep. 54 ad Macedon.)

V.

As to the manner in which the sinner was reconciled or pardoned we know that for a long time it was believed by theologians that absolution being a judicial sentence could be administered validly only in the indicative or imperative form; but in presence of the fact that up to the thirteenth century all the known forms of absolution are only prayers and still continue to be so in the Oriental churches,

[7] Quos quidem separatos a nobis non dereliquimus, sed ipsos cohortati sumus et hortamur agere pœnitentiam si quomodo indulgentiam poterint recipere ad eo qui potest præstare, ne si relicti a nobis fuerint, pejores efficiantur.

it is now generally admitted that the deprecatory form was sufficient. These prayers, begging forgiveness for the sinner, were pronounced (sometimes the same, sometimes different) when the penance was imposed, several times while it lasted, and finally in the solemn reconciliation at its close. Hence a difference of opinion as to when sacramental absolution was really granted. Lack of space forbids us to discuss the question here, but we have no doubt that, as a rule, forgiveness of sin was granted only in the formal reconciliation at the end.

What is much more difficult to determine exactly is the sense which the ancients attached to the action of the Church in reconciling the sinner. Their language in that regard is often obscure, confused and sometimes contradictory; nor can we fairly expect it to be otherwise in so complex a subject. Catholic theology slowly elaborated has made all clear to us, but in the early ages the faithful and their teachers were left in many things to themselves. They knew that repentance had lost nothing of its power to secure forgiveness. They further believed that to be effective (with or without the action of the Church) it had to bear a certain proportion to the extent of the sinner's guilt, proportion which could only be guessed at, yet by which the granting or denial of absolution was determined. Fervor in the penitential exercises caused it to be hastened, lukewarmness to be deferred. The clergy of Rome in their letter to St. Cyprian speak of apostates who "by tears and groans show a truly repentant spirit;" yet because the proximity of death forbids them to go through the whole process of expiation, they are reconciled with fear and trembling, "God Himself knowing what He will do with such and what way He will examine the balance of His judgment." Right through the early ages this is the prevailing tone. To repentance, to sorrow and works of atonement is the justification of the sinner almost entirely ascribed. The early fathers, as we have seen, talk of repentance and nothing more. Tertullian ("De Pœnitentia") in describing it makes no mention of the action of the Church. Origen seems chiefly to rely on the sinner's sorrow and good works as a means of forgiveness. "*Et tu*," says St. Ambrose, "*si vis veniam mereri, dilue lacrymis culpam tuam.*" In his books on Penance he indicates, it is true, the power of the Church, but at the same time he seems to place the hope of forgiveness principally in the sorrow and atonement of the sinner. And this is the prevailing note of the whole fourth and fifth centuries. The prayers of others and one's own, alms, austerities of various kinds, these are the means that seem to be almost entirely relied on. Of this we

have a striking example in the "Vitæ Patrum; or, Lives of the Fathers of the Desert." They abound in stories of sinners who withdraw from the world to do penance, or of anchorites who having momentarily fallen from grace return repentant to their solitary life. Now what they all rely upon to obtain forgiveness is the austere discipline to which they voluntarily submit themselves. In his "Ladder of Heaven" St. John Climacus describes a monastery in which the penitents, imprisoned at their own wish, were ever inventing new contrivances for tormenting themselves, and thought only of adding to their sufferings. Their sighs and groans could be heard from afar, and when strangers came near them their only words would be: "Do you think God will ever forgive us?" Their only hope seems to be in their atonements and the prayers they begged for. There is no turning, so far as we can see, to the power of the keys. The fact is, in all these stories of sinners seeking to obtain forgiveness we find no mention of an appeal to bishop or priest. The penitent, moved by the grace of God or by the advice of some holy anchorite (not a priest), embraced the penitential life of the desert, and pardon reaches him suddenly from above, or slowly through the expiatory works; but not, so far as the narrative shows, through any priestly agency.

And yet, as far back as we can see distinctly into the past, the sinner had always to turn to the Church, and neither in life nor in death did he feel secure unless the Church had forgiven him. The two doctrines, "forgiveness through repentance" and "forgiveness through the power of the keys," were held simultaneously, but without any attempt to determine the part of each or to harmonize their action. That so obvious a question should have been so long neglected is strange indeed; but not more so than in the case of many other problems which had to wait for the active and penetrating minds of the schoolmen. We meet this one for the first time exposed at length in the *Decretum* of Gratian (A. D. 1115), causa xxxiii., 93 dist. 1, under this form: *"Utrum sola cordis contritione et secreta satisfactione absque oris confessione quisquis possit Deo satisfacere?"* and, strange to say, instead of a formal response in the negative the great canonist gives authorities, Scriptural and Patristic, on both sides, and concludes thus: *"Cui harum sententiarum ritius adhærendum sit, lectoris judicio reservatur. Utraque enim fautores habet sapientes et religiosos viros."* In a word, he leaves it an open question, and an open question it remains for the next two hundred years, dividing the keenest minds and the highest authorities, not, indeed, as a practical problem, for the obligation of confes-

sion was not questioned, but as to what was the share of absolution in the remission of sin. The discussion is most interesting to follow in the theologians of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Petrus Lombardus (A. D. 1130) adopts in his "Sentences" the opinion of Cardinal Pullus: *"A peccatis solvit sacerdos, non utique quod peccata dimittat, sed quod dimissa (per contritionem) sacramento pandat;"* and adds: *"Nec ideo negamus sacerdotibus concessam fuisse potestatem dimittendi et retinendi peccata, idest, ostendendi homines esse ligatos vel solutos. . . . Ligant quoque dum satisfactionem confidentibus imponent; solvunt quum de ea aliquid dimittunt—et ad communionem admittunt."* The great "Master," as he was called, drew after him the bulk of theologians, among others Albert the Great. His opinion, says Morinus (p. 505) variously expanded, prevailed in the schools for nearly a hundred years. Only one kind of contrition was thought of, and that, it was held, secured forgiveness before the reception of absolution. It was only gradually, slowly and amid much speculation that subsequently the opposite view took hold and finally triumphed.

If so much obscurity gathered around questions of such importance through a lengthened period of intelligent discussion, how much more must have prevailed before close consecutive thought had been given to the subject. A certain school of theologians instinctively proceed on the principle that all was perfectly understood and correctly practised in the Church from the beginning. They fight hard against anything that they cannot justify, and what is too well attested to be denied they strive to twist into conformity with the fuller and more accurate conceptions of a later period. But the facts are often too strong for them, and hence the ever growing number of theologians who, with intentions equally pure, but with more intellectual honesty, accommodate their theories to the facts instead of twisting the facts in order to make them fit into preconceived theories. Thus they realize that while certain fundamental doctrines, such as the Incarnation, the Redemption, the Real Presence, stand out in their general lines as boldly and as distinctly from the first as at any subsequent period, their developments, logical and practical, were the work of ages; that the full meaning, measure and application of the Gospel institutions were understood in many particulars long after they were established; that, consequently, instead of taking it for granted that all in the early Church was just as we find it in our time, we have to study in detail each doctrine, each institution, such as the episcopate, the Papal supremacy, the sacraments, and ascertain by direct examination how

far any given writer, or church, or age thought as we think or acted according to the principles which guide us at the present day.

Studied thus Christian antiquity gives us all the constitutive elements of the sacrament of penance, contrition, confession, satisfaction, absolution, but has no definite theory as to the share of each in the reconciliation of the sinner. We may well suppose that there were those in early times who, like the theologians of the twelfth century, ascribed to the contrition of the sinner the forgiveness of his sin, and who saw little more in absolution than reconciliation with the Church. We can understand how, for disciplinary purposes, those who held that view denied absolution to the relapsed, and how the growth of the opposite opinion led to a contrary practice.

We see how the problem of modern theologians—at what time and in what form forgiveness was imparted to the sinner—did not even occur to many, while such as assigned forgiveness to the power of the keys did not necessarily ask themselves which of the prayers said over the penitents produced the sacramental effect any more than they inquired which of the many unctions applied to the sick by a priest or by several priests, as in the Greek rite, acted sacramentally upon them. They performed the complex ceremony, believed in its mysterious efficacy and left the rest to God and to the curious inquiries of later generations. In nothing, perhaps, is the ancient discipline so unlike ours as in the amount of sorrow and expiation required of the repentant sinner. But this is because the Church aimed at effecting a radical change and a renovation so thorough in the sinner that his perseverance might be looked upon as morally certain, whereas we, doubtless for good reasons, content ourselves with a sorrow and a resolve to amend which, though weak and often ineffective, are for the time being honest and sincere.

We now return to the "History of Auricular Confession," which led us into the foregoing reflections. They correspond only to the earlier portion of Dr. Lea's work, for he pursues the subject down to the present day. All in it is new to him, and all interesting. To us its later stages are better known, some quite familiar, and we prefer to look at things as they were at the beginning. Yet the sequel of Dr. Lea's book is suggestive and not undeserving a critical discussion; but such a thing in dealing with the present work is no easy task. If what is objectionable were confined to a few positions or statements it could be handled without any special difficulty.

But in the present case it extends all over the book. Almost at every page there are facts misinterpreted, passages misunderstood, proofs weak or sophistical, suggestions unfounded, so that nothing short of a continuous abundant gloss would suffice to redress all that is faulty. As we have said, there is no close discussion, no definite position on most points. The truth is, Dr. Lea is an admirable compiler, but not a historian. He is sometimes overpowered by the abundance of his materials, and handles them or drops them like one who fails to see their value, or knows not how to dispose of them. He evidently delights in demolishing, but shows no taste to build. The constructive power is wanting. Hence, notwithstanding our wish to welcome a work on a great theological subject upon which so much labor has been spent, and, even though out of harmony on some points with Catholic belief, to recommend it to our readers, yet we find it difficult to do so. For any one unacquainted with the subject, the book, though full of information, is absolutely misleading. For others better equipped, it is confusing and perplexing. Yet at least for the latter it is truly suggestive. It calls attention to a vast number of interesting facts and testimonies generally unknown or unnoticed. It opens up many questions and leads to investigate them. It compels the student to go back to the sources and get their meaning at first hand. It brings home to him, finally, the value of the work of Catholic ages on the original data of faith and practice, and supplies the proof that to yield solid theological wealth, even so rich a mine as the early Christian Ages needs to be worked by Catholic hands.

J. Hogan.

St. John's Seminary, Brighton, Mass.

RITUAL IN THE REIGN OF MAXIMIN.

I AM about to describe and discuss a work which has excited much attention among liturgical writers: "Testamentum Domini Nostri Jesu Christi, nunc primum edidit, Latine reddidiet et illustravit Ignatius Ephraem II. Rahmani, Patriarcha Antiochenus Syrorum. Moguntiæ, Sumptibus Francisci Kircheim, 1899." The book purports to be an addition to the Gospels, a discourse of our Saviour to His Apostles after His resurrection, containing first a prediction of Antichrist; secondly, a minute ritual supposed to be

there and then prescribed by Christ Himself. The work is an unmistakable forgery. The prediction is worthless, but the details of ritual are of great value. Embodying as they do many known fragments of ancient liturgy, they are evidently no mere inventions of the writer. He could not have expected to impose a new system of rites on the Church. He must have set down what he saw being done before his eyes, possibly with some little amplification of his own. Mgr. Rahmani, Catholic Patriarch of Antioch of the Syriac Rite, discovered the work as one portion of a Syriac manuscript, preserved at Mossul on the Tigris, dated A. D. 1654. He has published the Syriac text with a Latin translation. It has never been published before in its entirety. Fragments of it, however, appear in a Paris manuscript of the eighth century, published by Lagarde. The work is extant in another Syriac manuscript in the library of the Propaganda at Rome, dated A. D. 1578. A fourteenth century Arabic manuscript in the same library, purporting to be a translation from a Coptic manuscript of the tenth century, exhibits the same work. In the British Museum are two manuscripts of an Ethiopian version of the same. From the Mossul and the Roman manuscripts we learn that the work was translated into Syriac from the Greek in the year 687 A. D. This makes Greek the original language, so far back as we can trace the work. The title, in which the work is attributed to "Clement the Roman, disciple of Peter," is simply part of the forgery. The "Testamentum" covers much the same ground as the "Apostolic Constitutions," edited in the Coptic with an English translation by Tattam in 1848, and the "Canons of Hippolytus," of which a Latin translation from the Arabic was published by Mgr. de Haneberg in 1870. Mgr. Rahmani argues that the "Apostolic Constitutions" are founded upon this "Testamentum" which he publishes, being a second edition abridged and adapted to the discipline of a somewhat later age. The so-called "Canons of Hippolytus" he shows to be a clumsy forgery, the work of some clumsy compiler of a still later date. Yet a third work, called the "Eighth Book of Apostolic Constitutions," he considers to be derived from the "Apostolic Constitutions" above mentioned, otherwise called the "Ecclesiastical Canons," that is to say, from the second edition of the "Testamentum," put forward, he thinks, some time in the third century. The "Testamentum" itself he assigns to the second century ("Prolegomena," p. 48). Thus, if Mgr. Rahmani is right, the "Testamentum D. N. Jesu Christi" appeared some time between 100 and 200 A. D. A second edition, the "Ecclesiastical Canons,"

and a third edition, the "Eighth Book of Apostolic Constitutions," appeared between 200 and 300 A. D. He inclines to think that the "Testamentum" first saw the light in Syria, to which country what I have called the second and third editions of the "Testamentum" also belong. Certain indications seem to me to refer the work to the third rather than to the second century. Still it is most valuable as exhibiting apocryphal gospel, to be sure, but actual ritual, the ritual under which the sacraments were conferred which nourished the martyrs to victory.

The apocryphal prophecy of Antichrist and his times (supposed, of course, to be close at hand) which the inventor places in the mouth of our Lord after His resurrection betrays its apocryphal origin by the ineptitudes into which, after a fair beginning, it speedily descends. Antichrist is to have a head like a flame of fire, his right eye bloodshot, his left eye blue, with two pupils; his eyelashes white, his lower lip large, his right thigh shrunken, his feet broad, his middle finger flattened out and oblong. Portents to proceed his coming are the birth of children with white hair and the faces of old men, who shall foretell the end of the world and then beg immediately to be killed, dragons born of women, infant souls without bodies, quadruped infants, and the like trash. Of this nothing can be made. But another part of the prophecy affords some clue to the age of the composer. Apocryphal prophecy represents contemporary history. We read: "There shall be princes lovers of money, enemies of truth, slayers of their brethren, . . . kinsmen indeed of one another, but not in mutual concord, every one longing to destroy his partner's life. Through their armies shall be great distresses, flights and shedding of blood. But there shall arise in the west a king of foreign stock, a prince of extreme guile, godless, a murderer, a deceiver, covetous of gold, most crafty, wicked, an enemy and persecutor of the faithful." The second century had no such sad experiences, filled as great part of it was with the peaceful reign of the Antonines. But the years of the third century (212-235) exactly verify the pretended prophecy. Severus, dying in 211, left his empire to his two sons, Geta and Caracalla. In 212 Geta was murdered by Caracalla. This represents "princes, slayers of their brethren." Caracalla himself and the three succeeding emperors, Macrinus, Heliogabalus and Alexander Severus, all met with violent deaths. Heliogabalus in particular merits all the abuse which the prohetic author pours upon the princes of his time. In 235 "a king of foreign stock," the Thracian peasant Maximin, intruded himself upon the throne of the Cæsars—Maximin,

the well-known "enemy and persecutor of the faithful," as the acts of St. Catherine of Alexandria and other martyrs attest. There were also to be "unrighteous pastors," who were to cause much trouble in the Church. Syria and Asia Minor were to be the scene of signal calamities. This may point to the Montanist and Cataphrygian heretics, who, as the name of the latter shows, were conspicuous in Asia Minor. "Unrighteous pastors" figure more in the history of the third than of the second century. Hence I think that Mgr. Rahmani has antedated the "Testamentum," and that it really belongs to the first half of the third century, not to the second.

From prophecy we pass to the main element, the only valuable element of the "Testamentum," the liturgical directions which are attributed to Christ Himself. First the sacred edifices are described on a scale quite inconsistent with catacombs, presenting the Church as living in the light of publicity, and by no means wanting for money. Such publicity, less possible at Rome under the immediate ken of the Emperor, was not denied to the Church in remoter parts of the empire in the second and third centuries. The details given remind us of a Cathedral, with palace, Cathedral close and canons' houses; or to recur to a fourth century precedent, to the erections of St. Basil at Cæsarea.[1] I enumerate the various buildings according to the names given. It would not be easy to draw an architectural plan of the whole. The church has three entrances. To the east is the altar and the Bishop's throne, raised three steps. The altar is curtained off. To the right and left (south and north side) of the altar are two porticoes, one for men and one for women. There is a catechumen's chapel, also a *diaconicon* where offerings are made for the Holy Table. The *diaconicon* is a hall, surrounded by a portico. Within or beyond this hall is a baptistry. Near the *diaconicon* is the treasury. There is also a registry, where their names are taken down who have made offerings for the altar, or for whom offerings have been made, that they may be prayed for in the holy sacrifice. There is a Bishop's house, a house of widows, houses of priests and deacons and a guest house.

The Bishop is elected by the whole people. All the neighboring Bishops meet and impose hands upon him, with a prayer, short and somewhat vague, still used in the Syrian pontifical; after which one Bishop alone, deputed by the rest, imposes his hands, reciting the consecration prayer, a long prayer still in use in the consecration of Bishops of the Coptic and the Syrian rite. The prayer contains these words, sufficiently significant of the powers of a Bishop:

[1] See "Saint Basile," par Paul Allard (Lecoffre, Paris.)

"Father, who knowest the hearts of all, grant to this thy servant, whom thou hast chosen to the episcopate, that he may feed thy holy flock, and exercise the functions of the high priesthood without reproach, ministering to thee night and day. May thy face appear to him, and render him worthy of offering to thee diligently and with all fear the oblations of thy holy Church. Impart to him that he may have thy spirit, strong in power to loosen all bonds, as thou didst grant it to thy apostles."

The first book of the "Testamentum" may be thus analysed: The sacred buildings, the Bishop and the ritual concerning him, especially the rite of the Eucharistic oblation, the presbyters and their ritual, deacons and their ritual, canonical widows and their ritual. The second book treats principally of catechumens, of baptism and of the Office for Easter Eve.

The Bishop is to fast six days a week for the three weeks succeeding his consecration and three days every week for the rest of his life. This latter fast the presbyters also are to observe. He is to abstain perpetually from flesh meat, not, however, as though such food were blameworthy in itself. "Wine he is never to taste, except only the chalice of the oblation." On this curious subject we shall have more to say. The like abstinence was incumbent also on the presbyters. One would wish to know from other historical evidence how far our author here was merely theorizing, and how far he is setting down what he actually saw put in practice.

The holy sacrifice is to be offered only on Saturday or Sunday and "on the fast day." From Tertullian (*de jejun.* ii., 14) we learn that Wednesdays and Fridays every week were fast days; this, however, our author does not say. The sacrifice is offered by the Bishop, with the presbyters standing around him. When the Bishop is indisposed one of the presbyters offers it in his stead. This extends the power of offering sacrifice to the second order of priesthood. Ordinarily, however, the presbyters do not exercise this power. There is no clear trace of their celebrating along with the Bishop. They impose their hands with him upon the bread to be consecrated, but the words of consecration, so far as we learn from the "Testamentum," are spoken by the Bishop alone. The essential rite of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, at which only the baptized were allowed to assist, is thus described:

The deacon makes this proclamation: "Lift your hearts to heaven. If any one has hatred against his neighbor, let him be reconciled. If any one is conscious of incredulity, let him confess. If any one has a mind estranged from the commandments, let him

depart. If any has fallen into sin, let him not hide himself (*i. e.*, hide his sin); it is wicked to hide himself. If any one labors under a sick mind, let him not approach. If any be polluted, if any not firm, let him give place. If any one be estranged from the precepts of Jesus, let him depart. If any one despises the prophets, let him leave the company; let him keep himself from the anger of the Only-begotten. Let us not despise the cross; let us fly from the threats of our Lord. We have the Father of lights seeing with the Son, and the angels visitors. Look to yourselves, that you keep not hatred against your neighbors. Look that none remain in anger; God sees. Lift up your hearts to offer unto salvation of life and holiness. By the wisdom of God let us receive the grace that is given us."

"Then the Bishop confessing and giving thanks is to say in a loud and solemn voice." What follows is the preface, with the responses preceding it:

"'Our Lord be with you.' Let the people answer: 'And with thy spirit.' Let the Bishop say: 'Lift up your hearts.' Let the people say: 'We have unto the Lord.' Let the Bishop say: 'Let us confess [*i. e.*, give praise] to the Lord.' Let all the people say: 'It is meet and just.' Let the Bishop cry: 'Holy things by the holy.' Let all the people cry together: 'In heaven and on earth unceasingly.'"

The preface ensuing is quite unlike anything in our Missals. It is joined on to the Canon without any *Sanctus* intervening. The Canon is a continuous prayer to the Father, to the Son, and again to the Father, continuing thus: "Through thine Only-begotten Son, who was crucified for our sins, Thou, O Lord, hast sent into a virgin's womb thy Word, the Son of thy mind and Son of thy existence, through whom thou didst make all things, whereas in him thou wast well pleased; who, when he was conceived and made flesh, appeared as thy Son, born of the Holy Ghost and of a Virgin; who, fulfilling thy will and making ready a holy people, stretched out his hands to suffering that he might deliver them that have hoped in Thee from suffering and the corruption of death; who, when he was given over to his voluntary passion to raise them that were fallen, etc.—taking bread, gave to his disciples, saying: 'Take, eat, this is my body that is broken for you unto remission of sins. As often as you shall do this, you shall enact my resurrection.' [Curious variant from I. Cor. xi., 26.] In like manner the chalice of wine that he mixed, he gave unto a figure of the blood that was shed for us."

The "Ecclesiastical Canons," taken to be another edition of the "Testamentum," here read: "In like manner the chalice of wine that he mixed, saying: 'This is my blood that is shed for you.'" Ancient scribes had odd ways, and we cannot tell whether the writer of the parent manuscript of our MSS. of the "Testamentum" curtailed the form of consecration of the chalice out of reverence, or because it was so well known, as even now to many priests the words of consecration printed in the missal or on the altar card are practically useless there. What follows is called the *anamnesis*, or *recollection*, still easily recognizable in our rite:

"Mindful, therefore, of thy death and resurrection, we offer thee bread and cup, giving thanks to thee, who alone art God forever and our Saviour, because thou hast made us worthy to stand before thee and fulfil the ministry of priesthood unto thee. Wherefore we give thee thanks, we thy servants, O Lord." The last sentence is repeated by the people. It will be noticed that the *anamnesis* is addressed to the Son; that he whose death and resurrection is commemorated is distinctly styled God, and that in what we may take to be at any rate an ante-Nicene liturgy. The bearing of the pre-consecration prayer against the heresy of Nestorius is also observable.

The prayer continues: "Eternal Trinity [the term *Trinity* is as old as the second century], Lord Jesus Christ, Lord Father, Lord Holy Ghost." St. Ignatius of Antioch in his epistle to the Magnesians puts the three Persons in the same order, "in the Son and in the Father and in the Spirit," probably because through the Son we have access to the Father. Also St. Paul (II. Cor. xiii., 13): "The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the charity of God, and the communication of the Holy Spirit." Corresponding to the *epiklesis* (invocation), which in the Latin Church now stands in the form, "Bid these gifts to be carried by the hands of thy holy angel to thy altar on high," we find here: "Bring this drink and this food of thy holiness, make them be to us not unto judgment, nor unto disgrace or unto perdition, but unto the healing and strength of our spirit." This primitive *epiklesis*, unlike that in use among the Greeks, could never be taken for a consecration prayer. The prayer goes on with a double *memento* for the living and for the dead. The former is principally made up of these words: "Sustain unto the end those who are in the enjoyment of graces of revelations, confirm them who enjoy the grace of healing, strengthen them who have the power of tongues, direct them who labor in the word of doctrine." For the explanation of this passage we must turn to

St. Paul, I. Cor. xii., xiii., xiv., on which St. Chrysostom writes as follows: "This passage is very obscure, owing to our ignorance and inexperience of things that happened when St. Paul wrote [and continued to happen when the author of this 'Testamentum' wrote], but do not happen now [A. D. 396]. In those days after baptism one immediately spoke in strange tongues; many also prophesied; some worked miracles. . . . They received the Holy Spirit in the instant of their baptism; but they could not see the Spirit, as He is invisible, and therefore the miraculous grace gave them a sensible proof of his operation. Thus at once one there was speaking the language of the Persians, another that of the Romans, another that of the Indians, and so of the rest. This was a sensible proof to those outside the faith that the Spirit was in the person of the speaker. They also raised the dead, chased out devils and did other wonders." St. Irenæus (martyred A. D. 202) testifies to permanence of these miraculous gifts in the Church in his time (Iren. ii., 32). How long before the time of St. John Chrysostom they came to an end I am unable to say. They are frequently mentioned in this "Testamentum," and persons who enjoyed them were assigned a place of honor in the Church, immediately after the clergy. This fact argues the early date of the "Testamentum," though it does not necessarily place it in the second century.

The *memento* for the dead is brief: "Remember them who have fallen asleep in the faith, and give us inheritance with thy saints." Elsewhere, in the bidding-prayer recited by the deacon, we have: "For the dead, who have passed away from the Church, let us entreat that the Lord may give them a place of rest." Elsewhere it is directed that in a certain case the goods of the deceased be distributed to the poor "in aid of his soul."

There is no mention of the Lord's Prayer in this liturgy. The bishop concludes: "Let the name of the Lord be blessed forever." People, "Amen." Priest, "Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord, blessed be the name of his glory." People, "Amen, Amen."

Then follows the Communion. The Holy Eucharist is distributed in both kinds by the deacon, as in St. Justin's days (Apol. i., 186). Mgr. Rahmani quotes Tertullian as saying: "Nor do we receive the Sacrament of the Eucharist from the hands of others than of the officiating (priests)." The custom seems to have been for the deacon to take round the chalice only, as we gather from the Acts of St. Lawrence. Hence Mgr. Rahmani argues that the *Testamentum* is prior to Tertullian, not a very cogent inference, for

customs vary not according to time, but according to place, and a custom may have lingered in Syria after it had been abolished in Africa. The deacon placed the Holy Communion in the receiver's hand, saying: "The body of Jesus Christ, the Holy Spirit, unto healing of body and soul." Before receiving, the communicant said this prayer: "Holy, holy, holy, ineffable Trinity, grant me to receive this body unto life, not unto condemnation. Grant me to produce fruits pleasing to thee, that pleasing thee I may live in thee, fulfilling thy precepts, and with confidence may invoke thee, Father, while I implore upon me thy kingdom and thy will: hallowed be thy name, O Lord, in me, because thou art strong and glorious, and to thee be glory forever. Amen." The first part of the Lord's Prayer may be detected in the conclusion of this prayer. The rubric directs: "After all have received, let them pray, praising and giving thanks for the receiving." The bishop recites a prayer, answering to the post communion, and the rite is done. There is no mention of any blessing.

Though Mass was only said three or four times in the week, and only on these occasions was there any gathering of the people in the church, yet we have the direction: "Let the faithful man be ever solicitous, before he takes (any other) food, to be partaker of the Eucharist, that he may be rendered incapable of hurt." The explanation is pretty clear that the people took the Blessed Sacrament with them to their own homes. There is other evidence for this in the Acts of the Martyrs. The practice may be alluded to in the "Testamentum," bk. II., n. 13: "Let him that is a friend or kinsman of a master of profane things not permit that person to offer praise with him, nor eat with him on any ground of kindred or propriety, lest perchance he give to the wolf the things that are ineffable and take to himself damnation." As the faithful were obliged to come to the church to receive and, we suppose, to carry home the Blessed Eucharist, if they were sick for any length of time it had to be taken to them, to presbyters by a presbyter, to other men by a deacon, to women by a deaconess (ib. n. 20). There is ground to conjecture that while it was the custom to reserve the Blessed Eucharist under both kinds, what the laity took to their homes and what was taken to them when sick was the species of bread alone. The grounds for this conjecture are these two rubrics: (1.) It is said of the bishops (b. I., n. 22): "Let him on no account taste wine, except only the chalice of oblation. This let him use both when he is sick and when he is well. For it is good that this be for priests alone." But where the liturgy is performed in the church, the

direction is for all to receive of the chalice, the clergy first and then the laity. (2.) Of the presbyter it is said (b. I., n. 31): "Let him fast, and if it do him good to take wine from the chalice, let it suffice him to take as much as he judges to be good for him, lest he take to his harm that drink which is for health." It may be said that the reference is to what we call the "altar wine," or the wine intended for use in the Holy Sacrifice before consecration. But altar wine is not kept in the chalice; and in those days, apparently, the wine as well as the bread for the Eucharist was the offering of the faithful expressly for that purpose, and could not lawfully be used except for consecration. Hence we may conjecture three things: (1) that the Holy Eucharist was reserved under both kinds: (2) that the chalice, so reserved, was for the communion of priests alone: (3) that when the laity communicated of the reserved Eucharist, they received only under the species of bread. I say advisedly "conjecture;" for the evidence of the "Testamentum" is too slight and vague to build any certainty upon in these points. Such conjectures as have suggested themselves to me I leave, with much diffidence as to their value, to the judgment of the erudite antiquarian.

The rite of ordaining a presbyter was simple, taking no more time than it would now take to ordain an acolyte. The whole body of priests bring up the candidate for priest's orders, and the bishop imposes his hand upon his head, the presbyters touching him and holding him the while, and the bishop says the ordination prayer. In it occur the words, "give him the spirit of presbyterate (*presbyteratus*, eldership) that groweth not old;" and also, "while he glorifies, blesses, exalts, gives thanks and raises the doxology at all times, day and night, to thy holy name." There is no mention of the power of sacrifice, except so far as these words may be taken to imply it. But there is evidence that the words were so taken; for we read elsewhere (b. I., n. 38): "Let the ordination of the deacon be done in this wise: the bishop alone imposes his hand upon him, for he is not ordained to the priesthood (*non enim ad sacerdotium ordinatur*), but to the ministry of serving the bishop and the Church." The conclusion is evident that, unlike the deacon, the presbyter was ordained to the priesthood. This is further conveyed by the rubric in the liturgy above referred to, that when the bishop was indisposed, he was "not to offer, but a presbyter is to offer." The *presbyteratus* therefore mentioned in the ordination formula involves sacrificial powers. In other words, the *presbyteratus* is a participation in the *sacerdotium*.

In b. I., n. 39, of the "Testamentum" we read the following extraordinary directions: "Whoever gives testimony and acknowledgment in bonds, in prison and in torments for the name of God, for this let not the hand be imposed on him for diaconate, nor again for presbyterate; for he has the honor of clergy, having been protected by God's hand through the confession (of faith). But if he is ordained bishop, he is worthy also of the imposition of the hand. If he is a confessor, but yet has not been called to judgment before the powers, nor afflicted with bonds, but has only confessed the faith, let him be accounted worthy of the imposition of the hand; for he receives [is a fit subject for?] the prayer of clergy [the ordination formula?] Let not [the bishop], however, repeat all the words and pray over him, but when the pastor goes on further, he receives the effect [of ordination]."[2] This obscure utterance perhaps expresses the private opinion of the author rather than the ecclesiastical practice of his age. I do not believe that anywhere confession of the faith was accepted as equivalent to ordination, or an unordained confessor of the faith allowed to minister as a priest. All that the passage means may be simply this, that any one who has confessed the faith and borne torments for his confession deserves as much consideration as a deacon or a priest, and without any ordination should sit high up among the clergy, a precedence that might be readily granted to such a hero and champion of Christ. The passage at any rate shows that at the time the Church was still under persecution, a fact, however, which falls in with the third century quite as well as with the second, and remained a fact up to the time of Constantine, A. D. 312. The traces of persecution are imprinted in several parts of the "Testamentum." Thus in the deacon's bidding-prayer: "For them who suffer persecution let us entreat that the Lord may give them patience and knowledge and perfect their labor. . . . For them who have lapsed [from the faith under torments] let us entreat that the Lord may not remember their ignorances and may withhold from them His threats." The deacon is "diligently to take note who come into the church, to discern whether they be lambs or rather wolves, . . . lest it happen that a spy come in and the liberty of the Church be assailed." The mention of the spy recalls the precautions necessary to be taken by English Catholics three centuries ago. And again (b. II., n. 5): "If any, being still a catechumen, is apprehended for My name and condemned to torments, and runs hastily to receive baptism, let not the pastor hesitate, but confer baptism upon him. But if he

[2] Suscipit enim cleri orationem. Non omnia tamen vocabula repetat oretque super ipsum; sed cum pastor ulterius progreditur ille effectum suscipit.

be put to a violent death before receiving baptism, let there be no perplexity about him; for he is justified as having been baptized in his own blood."

Baptism, Confirmation, Holy Eucharist, Holy Order and apparently Extreme Unction (there is a blessing of the *oleum infirmorum* by the bishop) are all in the "Testamentum." There is no clear evidence of the practice of confession. All mention of public penance is conspicuously absent, and that though we are told all about the catechumens and the arrangement of various classes of people in the Church. This omission Mgr. Rahmani takes to show that the "Testamentum" is certainly prior to the middle of the third century, and I think the argument a good one. I quote his words: "At the time of the author of the 'Testament' the penitents do not yet appear constituted a special class, nor is any proclamation made by the deacon to dismiss them, nor is there any trace throughout the entire book of any rite of reconciling them. Now, Gregory of Neocæsarea (233-270) mentions in his canonical epistle an *order of penitents* standing outside the door; and in the 'Teaching of the Apostles,' which is referred to at least the middle of the third century, it is distinctly prescribed that the penitents be restored by imposition of the hands of the bishop along with prayer." Another indication of early date is the continued prohibition to taste of anything strangled or offered to idols (b. II., n. 17; Cf. Acts xv., 20). Also the fact that the fast of Lent is limited to the last two days, Good Friday and Easter Eve. Lent is called "the forty days of Easter." During those days the people are to frequent the church continually, but there is no mention of their being fast-days (b. II., n. 8). On Good Friday and Easter Eve the fast was absolute, so that no food or drink was taken at all till the reception of the Paschal Communion after midnight (Cf., b. II., nn. 6, 20). Justin (d. 165 A. D.) Irenæus (d. 202), Tertullian (d. 240), mention this two days' fast as the custom of their time.

The "discipline of the secret" appears in full force in the "Testamentum." The Church hid her doctrines from the pagan world, and revealed them only gradually to the catechumens. The doctrine of the resurrection of the body was not revealed till after baptism. "Let no man hear a word of the resurrection before he has received baptism; for this is the new ordinance, having a new name, which none knoweth but him that receiveth" (b. II., n. 10; Cf. Apoc. II., 17). Before the Holy Sacrifice two instructions were given, one to the catechumens, to whom were read lessons from the prophets and the apostolic writings. Then the catechumens were

dismissed, and the baptized alone heard what is called the *Mystagogia*, "That they may offer with fear when they have recognized of what mystery they are made partakers," and again, "that the faithful may know to whom they are about to approach and who is their God and Father," and again, "that they may know of what they become partakers in the holy mysteries, and whose memory they celebrate by the Eucharist." The *Mystagogia* is an exposition, in decidedly Oriental language, of the Incarnation and the Redemption—an exposition thoroughly Catholic and orthodox. It contains these words: "He it is . . . who rose from the dead. He is not Man only, but also at the same time He is God. . . . His body, when it is broken, becomes our salvation, and His blood our spirit, life and sanctification. . . . He, then, who has been made Man is the Son of God, Lord. . . . This is the cross in which we glory that we may be glorified, whereby the perfect faithful who take it up sever themselves from all that is sensible or visible, as from a thing that does not really exist.[3] O ye who are reckoned strong, hence draw ye your strength, make deaf your visible ears, make blind your exterior eyes that you may know the will of Christ and the whole mystery of your deliverance."

It is interesting to note that the hours of the Divine Office were already fixed and office was regularly said at those hours, though in a form differing from the present chiefly in this, that it was not so exclusively composed of psalms and admitted more prayers of private and uninspired authorship. The Bishop is directed to pray in the church "at the first hour of the night, at midnight and at the first streak of dawn;" also "in the morning, at the third, sixth and ninth hour, at the twelfth hour [sunset] and at lamp-lighting" (b. I., n. 22). "The presbyter is to offer praise and thanksgiving in the same way as the Bishop" (b. I., n. 31). "They that are chaste" are to omit none of the above hours of prayer. The class of persons so designated will be considered presently. For ordinary laymen these directions are given: "The people are always to take care to pray at early dawn, as soon as they have risen from bed and have washed their hands. . . . Let all take care to pray at the third hour [9 A. M.] with grief and distress, either in the church, or, if they cannot go to church, at home: for that is the hour at which the Only-begotten was crucified. [This confirms the reading *hora tertia* in Mark xv., 25.] Likewise let there be prayer with sorrow at the sixth hour. . . . At the ninth hour also let prayer be prolonged, . . . for then life was laid open to the faithful,

[3] This is not idealism, but a recognition of the truth that sensible things, compared with divine things, are as nothing.

and blood and water flowed from the side of our Lord. At evening, as it is the beginning of the following day and presents an image of the resurrection, there is cause for praise. At midnight let them rise, praising and extolling God for the resurrection. At dawn let them praise with psalmody, since after his resurrection he (Christ) praised the Father, they (the apostles) singing psalms." (b. II., n. 24.)

On days on which the Holy Sacrifice was offered, that is, on Saturdays and Sundays, and on the fast day, which may have been Wednesday, or Friday, or both (Cf. Tertullian, de jejun. II., 14), a liturgical service was held called "the praise at dawn," four pages of prayers recited by the Bishop and responded to by the people, besides "four psalms and canticles," which were sung by "small boys, two maidens [curious precedent of antiquity for a "mixed choir"],[4] three deacons, three priests." When this was over the lector read the lessons, "a presbyter or deacon is to read the Gospel," then the Bishop or a presbyter delivered a sermon, the catechumens were then dismissed, the homily called *mystagogia* was read to the faithful, and the Holy Sacrifice was offered according to the rite above described. The canticles sung were the canticle of Moses (Exod. xv.), and probably Psalm lxxi. *(Deus judicium tuum)*, with the canticle either of Isaias xii. or of Habacuc iii. Also a short form of "daily praise" is given, to be said by the presbyters in church "each at the time to him prescribed." Also we read that "at midnight the assembly of the priests apart and the more perfect among the people are to offer praise: for at that hour our Lord rising celebrated His Father with praise,"—where note the phrase "our Lord" put, as the whole "Testamentum" is, in the mouth of Christ Himself.

In the above account we easily recognize the canonical hours—matins at midnight, lauds at peep of dawn, prime at sunrise, then tierce, sext, none, at their several hours, Vespers "at the twelfth hour," 6 P. M., or sunset, and compline "at lamp-lighting time." Most prominent and liturgically complete of all these canonical hours is decidedly lauds. Whoever will look at the oldest hymns in the Breviary, those of the Sunday and ferial offices, can have no doubt that lauds originally stood apart from matins, and were recited at peep of day: see the phrases *præco diei jam sonat, aurora lucem provehit, ales diei nuntius, lux intrat, albescit polus, lux ecce surgit aurea, ortus refulget lucifer, aurora jam spargit polum.* On the other hand, prime is said, *jam lucis orto sidere, i. e.*, at sunrise.

[4] *Duo virgines*, however, in the language of the "Testamentum" is ambiguous, and might mean two of the men vowed to celibacy, of whom more presently.

The interposition of the Christmas midnight Mass between matins and lauds tells the same story. At the time of the "Testamentum" Vespers show no special development; this again is a mark of antiquity.

The deacon is "the eye of the church." He is the man of business; he is the district visitor, looking after the poor, receiving guests, burying dead bodies (especially those cast up from the sea; there are several indications that the "Testamentum" was written for a seaside place); "he is not to worry the bishop *(episcopum non disturbet)*, but tell him everything on Sundays only." People who come late to service, he is to keep outside, lest the tumult made in introducing them be a distraction to those who pray" (b. I., n. 36). When at last the late comer is admitted, the deacon proclaims: "Let us pray for the brother who has come late, that the Lord will give him diligence." Thus, it is remarked, "diligence is increased, and the bond of charity is strengthened, and the negligent or slothful party is corrected." Can this be the origin of our petition in the litany "for our absent brethren?"

The "Testamentum" (b. I., nn. 40-43) well illustrates I. Tim. v. 3-10. "Widows with precedence," as they were called, form a special order, we might almost say of clergy. They are blessed by the bishop with a special prayer at the entrance of the sanctuary. They receive Holy Communion among the clergy, immediately after the deacons, before the lectors and sub-deacons.[5] At Mass they stand within the veil of the sanctuary, behind the presbyters who are on the bishop's left, as the deacons stand behind the presbyters on the bishop's right. They say office in the church, a few together or privately. Prayers are set down for their use at matins and lauds. They instruct catechumens, correct delinquents of their own sex, assist at the baptism of women and anoint them with holy oil. They are a distinct body from the deaconesses in the "Testamentum," and superior to them. Can it be that the singular honor paid to these widows in the early Church is a vestige of that paid by the first Christians to the Blessed Mother of Jesus after the Ascension of her Son?

"Let her be constituted a widow," says the "Testamentum," "who has long remained without a husband, and who having had many offers of marriage has nevertheless for the sake of the faith preferred to remain single. . . . Let her be proved, if she has brought up her children in holiness, if she has not taught them worldly wisdom, if she has formed them in the love of the holy law and of the Church, if she has loved and honored pilgrims, if she has been as-

[5] In the "Testamentum" the lector ranks above the sub-deacon.

siduous in prayer, . . . if she be fit to bear the yoke . . . loving simplicity, possessing nothing in this world, but constantly taking up and bearing about with her the cross, which is the undoing of all evil; night and day persevering about the altar, doing her work with cheerfulness and without display. . . . Let her look up the deaconesses. . . . If she has any property, let her give it over to the poor and the faithful. If she has none, she is to receive aid from the Church. . . . Let her not trouble about her children, but give them over to the Church, that living in the house of God they may become fit for the ministry of priesthood."

In this state of professed widowhood we discern some anticipation of religious life. Such anticipation was not confined to the aged nor to the female sex. We read (b. II., n. 8): "If any man (coming to baptism) wishes to vow chastity to God, let him be baptized before the others by the bishop." We find a whole section (b. I., n. 46) entitled, "Of celibates, men and women." It opens thus: "A celibate, male or female, is not appointed by man, nor ordained, but he himself of his own will separates himself, taking the name of celibate. Nor is the hand imposed upon him unto celibacy, since this state is the effect of his own will. These celibates must be bound to mortify their bodies, without prejudice to health; they must attend steadily every day to fastings and prayers with weeping and mourning, expecting their departure from the flesh at any time, and daily taking themselves for persons about to die." They were not ranked among the clergy, but had a certain precedence in receiving Holy Communion, and were to be held in honor by all.

On this subject, as also on the practice of almsgiving amounting to a partial community of goods in the early Church, further light is thrown by the following directions: "If any of the faithful, man or woman, departs this life, leaving children, let their goods be given to the Church, that the Church may be guardian of the children, and out of their possessions the poor also may be aided, that so God may grant the children grace, and rest to the parents who have left them behind. Let not him who has no children possess more goods (than he needs), but out of his possessions let him make ample distribution to the poor and to them in prison, reserving to himself such portion as is congruous and sufficient. If any one has children, and desires to retire to vow a single life, let him distribute all his goods to the poor and retire to lead the life of an ascete and dwell at the church, persevering in prayers and thanksgiving" (b. II., n. 15).

The only mention of penitents is in these two passages: "If any one persists in his fault or misconduct, let the deacon report him to the bishop, and let him be put apart for seven days, and then called, that he be not carried away (by temptation). If when he comes he is found to be still obstinate in his sin, let him be cut off till he is truly penitent and returns to himself and begs for readmission" (b. I., n. 34). "Let the deacon catechise them that are doing penance and lead them to the presbyters or the bishop, that they may be instructed and imbued with knowledge" (b. I., n. 37).

The following direction on matrimony leads up to the later recognized impediment of *disparitas cultus:* "Let no obstacle be thrown in the way of him who wishes to be joined in matrimony. . . . But let him contract marriage with a faithful Christian woman of a Christian family, who may keep her husband in the faith. The bishop is to give direction and take care" (b. II., n. 1).

Discretion is to be exercised in admitting candidates for baptism. Slaves are not to be admitted without the assent of their master being asked. If the master is a Christian, and refuses the slave a character, he is not admitted. If the master is a pagan and can show that the slave asks baptism out of hatred to his master, he is not admitted: otherwise he is admitted. Evil livers, priests of idols, makers and caretakers of idols, gladiators and all manner of professionals engaged in the arena or race course, also soldiers and magistrates, are shut out from baptism, unless they give up their occupation. These exclusions point to a time when idolatrous worship was bound up with service in the army or on the bench. "A schoolmaster in profane science," which seems to mean a teacher of classical literature, is recommended to give up his charge, but may continue in it if he has no other means of subsistence (b. II., n. 2). Signs of demoniac possession are expected to occur in some cases under the exorcisms that precede baptism. "Let them be exorcised from the day that they are chosen (for baptism); they are to be baptized at Easter time. As that time approaches, let the bishop take them apart, one by one, and exorcise them, that he may be convinced that they are one and all clean. For if it happens that any one of them is not clean or is possessed by an impure spirit, the witness of the impure spirit itself will convict him. Whoever is found debarred by such an impediment is to retire apart and be reprehended and rebuked for not having faithfully heard the word of precept and admonition, seeing that the evil and alien spirit has kept his abode in him" (b. II., n. 6).

On Easter Eve the *baptizandi* kneel before the bishop, who

stretches his hand over them and pronounces a long prayer of exorcism, where we note these beautiful words: "Man by thy hands was formed out of earth; but since he has come to believe in thee he is earth no more." The rubric adds: "If while the bishop is pronouncing the exorcism any one becomes agitated and suddenly gets up and weeps, or cries out, or foams at the mouth, or gnashes his teeth, or assumes an impudent stare, or too much lifts himself up, or, carried away by sudden impulse, makes off, let any such be hidden away by the deacons, that there be no brawling while the bishop speaks. Let such a person be exorcised by the priests until he is cleansed, and then let him be baptized" (b. II., n. 7).

The practice of infant baptism at this early epoch is gathered from the following rubric: "All children who can make answer for themselves at baptism are to answer, repeating the words after the priest; but if they cannot answer, let their parents answer for them, or some friend of theirs."

Two kinds of oil are used at baptism, having been blessed by the bishop. The one is called "the oil of exorcism," answering to our "oil of catechumens;" the other is the "oil of thanksgiving." The person to be baptized turns to the west (the region of darkness) and says: "I renounce thee, Satan, and all thy worship, thy pomps, thy desires, all thy works." The bishop then anoints him with the "oil of exorcism," saying: "I anoint thee with this oil for thy deliverance from every wicked and impure spirit and thy deliverance from all evil." Then the neophyte turns to the east (the land of light) and says: "I submit myself to thee, Father, Son and Holy Ghost, before whom all nature trembles and is afraid; grant that I may fulfil all the judgments of thy good pleasure without stain." Then the bishop hands him over to the presbyter who is to baptize him. Accompanied by a deacon, the neophyte steps into the waters, which must be "clean and running" (b. II., n. 8), apparently of a brook running through the baptistry [we remember how the Cistercian monasteries of old were always by a stream]. The presbyter puts his hand on the neophyte, now standing in the water, and asks him: "Dost thou believe in God the Father Almighty?" The neophyte replies, and the priest immerses his head for the first time. No formula of baptismal words is given, whence, however, it does not follow that none was used; the words may have been omitted as too obvious; compare the previous omission of the words of consecration of the chalice. On the other hand, from there being no mention of the blessing of the baptismal water, we have some ground to conjecture that the blessing of the font, so prominent in

our Holy Saturday service, is a later development. The priest asks again: "Dost thou believe also in Jesus Christ, the Son of God, who came from the Father, who from the beginning is with the Father, who was born of the Virgin Mary through the Holy Ghost, who was crucified under Pontius Pilate, died, rose again the third day, coming back to life from the dead, ascended into heaven, sits at the right hand of the Father, and is to come to judge the living and the dead?" The neophyte answers: "I believe," and the presbyter immerses his head for the second time. Then he asks: "Dost thou believe also in the Holy Ghost, the Holy Catholic Church?" The reply "I believe" is followed by the third immersion. As soon as the newly baptized comes out of the water the presbyter anoints him with the "oil of thanksgiving," saying: "I anoint thee with oil in the name of Jesus Christ." This corresponds to the unction with chrism in our baptism. The above interrogations manifestly contain the Apostles' Creed, still said by us on the way to the baptismal font. Why the article on the resurrection of the body is omitted has already been made clear. Due decency in the baptism of women was secured by the attendance of the canonical widows above described.

As soon as the baptisms are over the newly baptized are gathered together in the church and the bishop administers the sacrament of confirmation with a rite strikingly like that still in use in the Latin Church. The bishop stretches out his hand over them and says a prayer called the "invocation of the Holy Ghost." Then he pours oil (doubtless the "oil of thanksgiving") and lays his hand on the head of each, saying: "With this unction I anoint thee in God Almighty, in Christ Jesus and in the Holy Ghost, that thou mayest be a laborer having perfect faith, and a vessel pleasing to Him." And signing him [with the cross] on the forehead he gives him peace, saying: "The God of the humble be with thee," the person signed replying, "And with thy spirit."

Then the newly baptized and confirmed pray with the whole assembly of the faithful. The Holy Sacrifice is offered and all receive Communion. "The bread is offered," Christ is made to say, "in sign of My body, and the chalice is mingled with wine and water to signify blood and the water of baptism, that the inner man, who is spiritual, may deserve to receive similar gifts to those which the body receives," an exact description of what our catechism calls a sacrament, "an outward sign of inward grace." We may observe that the species of bread after consecration is a "sign" of Christ's body, not, however, an empty sign, when the body is really there.

If any conjecture of mine as to the date of the "Testamentum" be worth recording, after careful consideration of its contents I should still refer it to the first half of the third century. I have already shown some cause for fixing it within the reign of Maximin, A. D. 235-238, the age of St. Catherine of Alexandria, a little before the persecutions of Decius and Valerian and the martyrdom of St. Lawrence. The spirit of prayer and simple devotedness of God's service which it breathes, and which can only be appreciated by continuous perusal, tells of an age when Christianity meant martyrdom close at hand. The "Testamentum" may have gathered additions from the hands of subsequent transcribers, putting in the ritual practices of their own days; but such simplicity still marks it, and so many well-known practices of later times are conspicuously absent, that I think Mgr. Rahmani right in taking the "Testamentum" to represent, if not second century, at least early third century ritual, later additions being more apparent in such revisions of the "Testamentum" as the "Ecclesiastical Canons" and the "Apostolic Constitutions."

One thing the "Testamentum certainly is not, it is not Protestant; and one characteristic it strongly displays, it is redolent of sacerdotalism.

JOSEPH RICKABY, S. J.

London.

RISE OF THE CHRISTIAN SCHOOLS—DE LA SALLE.

"IN order to understand thoroughly," says Ravelet,[1] "the mission of St. de la Salle, it is necessary to know what the education of the people was at the period when he founded his Institute. A brief sketch of its history will not, therefore, be out of place here. This will enable us to see what the Church had done before his time, what yet remained to be done, and thus we shall understand, at a glance, the facilities and the obstacles which the ancient institutions brought to the new foundations."

The origin of the first Christian schools can be traced back to the cradle of Christianity. St. Paul, writing to his disciple, Timothy, says: "Attend to thyself and to doctrine; be earnest in them.[2] And the things, which thou hast heard from me, before many witnesses, the same commend to faithful men, *who shall be fit to teach others also.*"[3] There is no mistaking these words. The great Apostle of

[1] "Vie du St. J.-B. de la Salle," c. ii., p. 13. [2] I. Tim. c. iv., 16. [3] II. Tim. c. ii., 2.

the Gentiles was convinced of the need of a zealous and learned band of teachers which would aid him in the work of evangelization.

"In carrying the bright flame of Christian truth into the dense darkness of paganism, the Church exercised a right and accomplished a duty. This right and duty were founded upon the words of the Divine Master: *Go and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you.*"[4]

Christian instruction was, in the beginning, traditional. The neophytes received oral instructions. These were given in the Catecombs of Rome. The traveler who visits the Catecombs of St. Agnes will find there two rooms, having for their only ornament a chair for the catechist and benches for the catechumens. To-day that light sheds its lustre throughout the universe, and is not, as of old, confined within the narrow chambers of a catecomb. The poor, the ignorant and the little are called to enjoy its benefits; no man is excluded.

St. John the Evangelist opens a Christian school at Ephesus and forms excellent disciples. St. Polycarp, one of his disciples, founds a school at Smyrna. St. Mark establishes the school of Alexandria. The school became famous for the truly great Christian scholars and philosophers it produced.

Schools were also founded at Cesarea, Antioch, Constantinople, Nicomedia and other places. "The constant practice of the Syrian nation is never to have a church or monastery without having a school attached, nor a school without a monastery or church."[5]

In the shades of the first churches erected in the West, we beheld nestled sacred asylums destined by the Bishops for the two-fold object of fostering science and virtue in the future generations. Hence we find that the first Bishops who converted and civilized France established schools in their episcopal palaces and parishes. "The church and schools were inseparable for the people."[6] For Catholicism was the most efficient promoter of the popular development of the human intellect.[7] And "wherever a church was built we might be almost certain of finding also there a school."[8]

St. Hilarius, Bishop of Arles, a contemporary of Pope Leo I., lived with his clergy and clerics, forming with them a kind of seminary.[9] It was in this school that St. Cesarius, one of his successors,

[4] Cardinal de Bonechose, *Le Semaine Religieuse*, 27 Juili, 1872, Rouen. [5] Assemani, Bibl orient., t. IV., c. 1. [6] David, Gregory VII., p. 216. [7] Auguste Comte, Cours de Philosophie Positive, t. V., p. 258. [8] Ed. Schmit, L'Instruction Primaire à la Campagne, p. 6. [9] Vie de St. Hilaire; Œuvres de Saint Léon, t. II., p. 121.

gave his celebrated grammar lessons. Thus we have St. Remigius at Rheims, St. Germanus at Paris and St. Hilary at Poitiers, devoting themselves to teaching.[10]

The monastic schools also did good work in the cause of the education of youth. In the sixth century lay persons were admitted to these schools.[11] Hence it is that we find the monastery divided into two schools: the *cloistral*, for children who afterward embraced the religious life, and the *canonical*, for the education of children who embraced neither the ecclesiastical nor the religious state. For ecclesiastics these schools became real seminaries.[12]

The powerful influence and energetic action exercised by the great Charlemagne over all the schools of his vast empire are too well known to be commented upon in this brief sketch. Unfortunately for France, his successors did not display that enlightened zeal and keen appreciation for knowledge and virtue which rendered his reign so remarkable in the annals of the history of true progress and science.

While admitting that the schools were sadly neglected, we must beware of falling into the other extreme of presuming that, during this period, they were entirely deserted. "When speaking of the dark ages, it is very essential to distinguish carefully the epochs, and not apply to every century comprised in this long period the unfavorable and severe criticism which is applicable only to some."[13] We may add that the same careful distinction holds good in relation to the provinces. Some of them, less distracted by civil dissensions than others, happily preserved the academic traditions of the first apostles of Gaul. Again, they were favored in a twofold manner, *i. e.*, by reason of the number of schools and the great merit of their professors. While in other provinces many people openly declared themselves more or less averse to the impetus given to the schools by the Bishops, the King and the Parliament of Paris.[14]

From the eleventh to the fourteenth century there were three principal causes which contributed to the resuming of the interrupted work of Charlemagne: 1. The Councils; 2. The extraordinary renown of certain schools; and 3. The wonderful multiplication of religious communities. To be admitted to these communities it was necessary to have acquired a certain degree of knowledge.

In the fourteenth century the fearful ravages which punished or tried men in those remote days like the plague of 1348 necessarily closed a number of schools. Indeed, "few teachers could be found

[10] Théry, Histoire de l'Education en France. [11] Théry, ibid. [12] Auguste Teiner, t. I., p. 143. [13] R. de Beaurepaire, t. I., pp. 13, 51. [14] A. Babeau, L'École de Village pendant la Révolution, p. 4.

who would then be willing to teach the elements of grammar at home or in the village school."[15]

"The ravages of war, the terrible scourges of plague and famine that devastated whole peoples were as disastrous to the progress of education as they were to that of life and civilization. The school being sustained by local enterprise, varied with the fluctuations of local energy."[16]

There were, however, at this period, two men, Gerard Groot and Gerson, who labored with a vim and an energy in behalf of elementary schools. They tried to give the children attending such schools good, religious and zealous teachers.

Gerard (1340-1384), born at Deventer, Holland, made his studies in Paris. He was considered competent at eighteen to profess philosophy and theology at Cologne. Here he acquired fame because of his knowledge and eloquence and gained for himself the title of Groot or great. After he was ordained priest he was instrumental in converting many souls by his eloquence. Many flocked around him and became his disciples. Thus did he found the Clerks and the Brethren of the Common Life. He employed them according to their special aptitudes, either in copying manuscripts or in manual labor, or in teaching elementary schools, established for poor children. Gerard intended to adopt the Rules of the Canons Regular of St. Augustine, but death intervened. Floret, a true disciple, completed the religious work of his master.

Gerard Groot occupied his brethren chiefly in copying. He collected for this purpose the most correct and authentic manuscripts of the Bible and of the Fathers. These transcriptions were greatly admired and much sought after both for the beauty of their characters and correctness of text. The convents multiplied, especially in Flanders. Their manuscripts were highly appreciated at Rome and at the University of Louvain. But while thus engaged, the elementary schools under their control were by degrees abandoned.[17]

Gerson (1363-1429), the celebrated chancellor of the University of Paris, retired to the Convent of St. Paul, Lyons, and there devoted a portion of his time to the instruction of poor children. To teach the elements of knowledge to poor children was looked upon as degrading and unbecoming a man of learning and position.

[15] Guibert de Nogent, Coll. des Mém. sur l'Histoire de France, par Guizot, t. IX., p. 356. [16] Brother Azarias, Essays Educational, p, 193. [17] Thomas à Kempis was a member of the Brethren of the Common Life. He was regarded as one of the best skilled caligraphists of his time. His copy of the Bible, which took fifteen years to transcribe, is a real masterpiece. Another beautiful manuscript was the great work, the "Imitation of Christ." After the Bible, this little volume is the most extensively read work ever penned by man. It is a monument of Christian philosophy and piety. It is translated into every living language.

Gerson was indifferent to the praises of men. He was equally regardless of their contempt. To teach the first principles of Christian doctrine was his greatest desire. He was particularly careful to have his pupils attend Mass. He understood the value of a thorough Christian training. The children who appeared especially bright were also initiated in the elements of Latin. In his great humility and sense of unworthiness he taught the children to say: "O my God, my Creator, have mercy on Thy poor servant, John Gerson."

In his treatise "De parvulis trahendis ad Christum" we read these apt words: "Let the teacher remember his youth; let him preserve his pupils from evil by true devotedness. Let him be little with them; but let him always maintain his superiority by reason of his experience and knowledge."

Thus we find that at this epoch throughout France primary instruction was by no means neglected. Schools were to be found almost everywhere, for Gerson advises Bishops to inquire "if every parish has a school, and how the children are taught, and to open a school, if there be not one already."[18] Delisle tells us that "many documents superabundantly establish how rural schools were multiplied in the thirteenth century and in Normandy the following centuries."[19]

Again, "the organization of episcopal and monastic schools of the Middle Ages did not come to us from abroad already systematized. The faith of teachers, pupils and schedule of studies depended absolutely upon the will and judgment of the rector and Bishop. No universal rules existed or were in force to govern and regulate the course. Instruction varied in each diocese and even in the same school."[20] This undoubtedly resulted in much loss of time and in wrangling among professors.

Hence we may introduce the pertinent criticism of Hugh of St. Victor's: "When grammar is their subject, they discuss the nature of syllogisms; when treating of dialectics, they will occupy themselves with the inflection of words."[21] But on the other hand Hugh's master hand "has sketched for us a beautiful picture of student life in this monastery (St. Victor's). It is too valuable to leave unquoted:[22]

"Great is the multitude and various are the ages that I behold—boys, youths, young men and old men. *Various also are the studies.*

[18] Tractatus de visitatione prælatorum et curatorum, t. II., ed. 1560, Antwerp. [19] Étude sur la Condition des Classes Agricoles en Normandy, p. 176. [20] M. de Resbecq, Histoire de l'Enseignement Primaire avant 1879, etc., p. 73. [21] Quoted by Brother Azarias, Essays Educational, p. 34. [22] Ibid.

Some exercise their uncultured tongues in pronouncing our letters and in producing sounds that are new. Others learn by listening at first to the inflections of words, their composition and derivation; afterwards they repeat them to one another, and by repetition engrave them on their memory. Others work upon tablets covered with wax. Others trace upon membranes with a skilled hand diverse figures in diverse colors. Others, with a more ardent zeal, seem occupied with the most serious studies. They dispute among themselves, and each endeavors by a thousand plots and artifices to ensnare the other. I see some who are making computation. Others with instruments clearly trace the course and position of stars and the movements of the heavens. Others treat of the nature of plants, the constitution of man and the quality and virtue of all things."

In all the ancient little schools taught by ecclesiastics, religious and clerics Latin was found on the schedule of studies. If it was not taught it was because the teacher did not know it; but the defect was soon made good by substituting a more learned teacher.

Moreover, the reading of Latin was taught by all teachers. We may say that frequently the children were not taught to read in any other language. "Those who did not enter the religious life returned to the world when they were competent to read and interpret the Psalter and the Gospels. This was, indeed, little enough; but the requirements of civil life did not demand much knowledge."[23]

This course is unquestionably very limited. But we have other authorities who include "logic, the principles of versification, liturgic chant, the Old and the New Testament, theology, sometimes canon law, and later on Aristotle."[24] With such a curriculum the youth of the cloistral school had decidedly a fair education.

Some writers claim for Martin Luther the honor of having introduced primary schools. This is evidently an error, resulting not only from the confounding of terms, but also from ignorance of the facts. Luther "had not even a conception of primary teaching."[25] "It is true," says Ravelet,[26] "that Luther addressed a letter, in 1524, to all the Councillors of the German States urging them to found Christian schools, and fourteen years later, in 1538, he published 'Directions to Inspectors,' an essay on the general system of popular education. But these documents appeared several centuries later than the urgent decrees of the Council of Lateran. What Luther tried to do in Germany the provincial councils of France had suc-

[23] L. Maitre, Les Écoles Épiscopales et Monastiques, p. 254. [24] Brother Azarias, Essays Educational, p. 24. [25] Paul Rousselot, Pédagogie à l'usage de l'Enseignement Primaire, p. 35. [26] Vie du St. J.-B. de la Salle, p. 33.

ceeded in doing some years before in our provinces, and with more wisdom and precision." When we compare facts we learn that Luther speaks only after the councils. This is also true of the Gymnasium. An imperfect copy of the Catholic universities and the Jesuit colleges. The most celebrated Protestant pedagogue, Pestalozzi, lived a century after Saint de la Salle had matured and perfected his scheme of education, and which completely revolutionized the whole system of popular education.

Since the Reformation the State has obtained the control of secular education. Prior to this the Church held that exclusive privilege. The State never interfered. It aided and encouraged by erecting schools and universities and then endowed them. But the education of the masses was the duty and privilege of the Church. She was jealous of her right and duty. Consequently when Luther wants to establish schools all over Germany he writes to the German nobles: "It devolves upon you to take a hand in this work; for if we entrust the care of it to the parents, we shall perish a hundred times before the thing is done. I pray you, therefore, not to reject my advice, but to take to heart and to take in hand the salvation, happiness and the prosperity of Germany."[27]

"The direct and immediate effect of the Reformation," continues Ravelet, "was above all the ruin of a great number of schools. It swept over France like a pestilence, and everywhere gave rise to fearful strife. The school could not continue where the Church had been thrown down and burnt to the ground."

Besides, Luther insisted upon having Latin taught in the little schools. Consequently we cannot agree with those ardent writers who claim for him the distinguished honor of establishing the primary schools. Truly history does not sustain them. The Catholic clergy had already forestalled Luther in his efforts at popular education. Hence the monastic schools also supported a number of clerics who were destined for the profession of teaching.[28]

"The schoolmaster in the Middle Ages," says Brother Azarias,[29] "we may infer, was, up to the fifteenth century, generally a young ecclesiastic or cleric who dwelled with the pastor, helped him to sing the divine offices, aided him in many ways and generally acted as sacristan."

M. Mireur informs us that a teacher was frequently selected by the City Council upon the advice of fathers of families, without having any other guarantee of his character.[30] If several candidates

[27] Quoted by Ravelet, p. 34. [28] R. de Beaurepaire, t. I., p. 28. [29] Essays Educational, p. 181. Cf. also Ravelet, pp. 26, 27 and 28. [30] Documents sur L'Enseignement Primaire en Provence, p. 2.

presented themselves, the most competent was appointed. His ability was determined by a public examination. This was, however, only legally requisite when there was question of confiding to him a large school.[31]

Professional education in the hands of such schoolmasters was worthless. The material condition of the school fluctuated with the locality. Only some schoolmasters established themselves permanently in a commune or in a parish. They were men of virtue, and hence were worthy of the honors they received. But there were others to be found, and in great numbers, who were like rolling stones and hired themselves out to municipalities for a limited time.

There was, however, despite this deplorable inconsistency, one point upon which all schoolmasters were a unit, and that was to give their modest teaching a positive Christian character. In general their behavior was in accord with their teaching. St. Fulbert preferred to see the professor's chair vacant than behold it occupied by one unworthy of that honor. "I do not wish," he writes to Ifildegaire of Poitiers, "to send you a co-laborer for your school if he be not of mature judgment and of great moral purity." Stephen de Tournay expressed himself, in 1197, in similar terms: "The teacher should be of tried virtue and learned, and if he need an assistant he should be characterized by the same qualities."[32]

The object sought in all the schools was essentially religious. Hence the reason why the founders usually annexed them to the parish church. "Charlemagne was assiduously attentive to two objects: 1. The formation of good and learned priests. 2. The dissemination of the Christian faith among his subjects."[33] Throughout the Middle Ages the schools preserved their religious character. Hence we may justly apply the words of Joubert to the teachers of that period: "What we regret in the ancient education is its moral character."[34]

The low ebb of morality that prevailed in the sixteenth century had decidedly a baneful influence upon the little schools. And, if we add thereto the religious dissensions, we need not wonder at the widespread evil of ignorance and crime. But the Church was on the alert. She detected the evil, suggested the remedy, furnished the means of applying it effectively and insisted upon the strict observance of her decrees.

"The Council of Trent was the signal for a new development in public instruction. It commenced by reforming religious teaching."[35] The Council did not stop with formulating and promulgat-

[31] M. Boniface, Suite d'Arrêts notables du Parlement de Provence, t. I., p. 354. [32] L. Maître, p. 187. [33] Ibid, p. 4. [34] Pensées, t. II., p. 258, Edition, 1862. [35] Ravelet, p. 36.

ing explicit decrees concerning the education of ecclesiastics. It took the further step by prescribing that "in every church there be appointed an ecclesiastic to teach grammar gratuitously to clerical students and poor scholars." And why? "That they may be competent to study theology if God should call them to the ministry of the Church." It also legislates for the payment of those teachers and regulates how they should be treated.[36]

Consequently "nearly all the provincial councils and diocesan synods of the sixteenth century, before and after the Council of Trent, deal with the school question and decree that there be a school in every parish. In places too poor to maintain one an ecclesiastic or competent cleric is to be entrusted with the instruction of children."[37]

Therefore, "to understand all that the Church has done for popular instruction, to see how she has laid the first foundation of the present legislation, it is necessary to peruse attentively the synodal decrees of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries."[38]

We already noted that the first reform instituted by the Council of Trent was connected with the clergy and their education.[39] God raised up for that purpose several zealous and enlightened apostles, who took an active part in this reformation by establishing seminaries. It was in these nurseries of faith and piety that ecclesiastics were renewed in the spirit of sacrifice, prayer and study. They were likewise inspired with a zeal and love for their priestly duties.

Hence we need not wonder to find ecclesiastics occupied solely with the instruction of the children of the poor. Then, again, we see a work springing up in Italy, France and Austria forcibly reminding us of the ancient catechists of Ephesus, Alexandria and Jerusalem and opposing, under the familiar form of the sublime and divine teachings of the Gospel, the absurd doctrines of paganism. At Milan, Italy, St. Charles Borromeo and Mark Sadis establish the association of the Priests of Christian Doctrine, whose principal end and aim are to teach religion to the children and laboring classes. St. Ignatius Loyola inaugurated his generalship of the Society of Jesus by teaching the Christian doctrine several hours after his election in a church of Rome. Hence the disciples of the inspired St. Ignatius look upon the teaching of religion to children as one of their principal obligations.

"The spirit of teaching catechism, which diffused itself over the entire Church,"[40] had a beneficial effect upon France by stirring up

[36] IV. Session, c. I., June 17, 1546. [37] Ravelet, p. 37. [38] Ibid, p. 39 et passim. [39] Gallia Christiania, t. VIII., p. 1041. [40] Vie de César de Bus, quoted in the Life of M. J.-B. de la Salle, 1733, p. 150.

pious and heroic souls to devote themselves to the instruction of the people. For pastors had sadly neglected this important duty of their sacred ministry.[41] It devolved, therefore, upon schoolmasters to accomplish it. But many of them looked upon the teaching of Christian doctrine with a species of contempt. Indeed, there was a time when no man of any pretensions to learning would deign to break the bread of life to the little ones. The fear of derision and human respect proved the stumbling blocks. The schoolmaster preferred his own honor to the honor and glory of God. He no longer rejoiced in being considered worthy to suffer contempt for Christ's sake.

But César de Bus (1544-1607) and the Priests of the Christian Doctrine acted as a powerful lever against the prevailing spirit of religious indifference. The impetus imparted by these zealous and devoted men at Cavaillon made itself felt. It leaped the narrow limits of the diocese and like a consuming flame throughout Comtat-Venaissin, Provence, and Languedoc,[42] and by degrees extended to other provinces.[43] The chief feature of César de Bus' method was the teaching of Christian doctrine by discussion.[44]

And yet these men of God, when contemplating the end proposed, were soon convinced of their insufficiency. The field was large; the laborers few. Again, the missions they gave were limited by time and locality. They could assemble the children but once or twice a week, and the instructions fell naturally upon unprepared soil. Hence the instruction was soon forgotten, because it was not comprehended.

When we come to examine the admirable work accomplished by a Vincent de Paul (1576-1660), a Bérulle (1575-1629), a Bourdoise (1590-1655), an Olier (1608-1657) and a Eudes (1601-1680), we must candidly acknowledge that much was still left undone toward the regeneration of society. The Bishops, however, availed themselves of reforms instituted by great men. They applied to them for clergy who were deeply penetrated with a sense of their duties. They also sought for ecclesiastics or clerics to take charge of their little schools. For these modest institutions had been either destroyed or discredited owing to the ravages of civil strifes or to the lack of proper vigilance and control or to poverty and want of teachers.

In the little schools Christian doctrine was not universally taught;

[41] The Rev. F. Bridgett, C. SS. R., Life and Times of B. Cardinal Fisher. Read the sad picture presented in England under Henry VIII. Bishops and priests were indifferent to the duties of their sacred calling. The people were ignorant of the essentials of religion. The same was true for Italy. Cf. Vaughan's Life and Times of Thomas of Aquin. Cf. also Janssen's History of the German People. [42] Annales de L'Institut, t. I., Introduction, p. xviii. [43] Ravelet, p. 85. [44] Ibid, p. 86.

but the children were generally educated in a Christian manner. The poor children, however, were often either neglected or ill-treated by teachers who did not possess the requisite qualities of their profession. The complaints tendered by men of rank and position were truly lamentable. M. de Lantages lamented that no person could be found in the rural districts of Velay to instruct and educate the children.[45] In 1669 Charles Démia found that the great number of the teachers of Lyons "were ignorant not only of the methods of good reading and writing, but also of the principles of religion. Several of them were heretics and impious men. Nay, more, he met even some who were professed libertines. Hence the youth confided to their care were in evident danger of being lost."[46]

Paris was no better off in this respect than Lyons. The precentor, Claude Joly, was accused of having tolerated "junkshop men, keepers of low restaurants, tavern-keepers, masons, wig-makers, fiddlers, puppet-show men, etc.," as schoolmasters in Paris.[47] These complaints, however, did not affect all the little schools. The only schools that suffered were the schools destined for the poor children. "It is true," says Charles Démia, "that the children of the better class receive moral instructions at home and from the schoolmasters, paid by the parents, or else in the colleges from the regents who are remunerated by the city. But the poor have no means whatsoever to educate their children. And the consequence is that they remain ignorant of their duties. This is obvious. The parents have to struggle for existence, and hence neglect to teach their children how to live well. Moreover, having been wretchedly educated themselves, they cannot give what they do not possess. Hence we observe with deep sorrow that the education of the poor children is entirely neglected."[48]

The most effective remedy against this crying evil was already applied. It was to educate the clergy, *i. e.*, to oblige them to pursue their professional education, to regulate and govern their behavior in the classroom and to indicate and define their relations with the parents. However, the precentor and pastors had adopted no uniform course regulating the extent of their academic jurisdiction. Hence resulted incessant quarrels and vexatious lawsuits.[49] The precentor claimed the exclusive right to give teachers letters of recommendation, to deliver and revoke their certificates of teaching. He also insisted upon the privilege to appoint teachers to charity

[45] Vie, p. 93. [46] Vie de M. Démia, p. 81. Cf. Ravelet, pp. 73, 4 and 5. [47] Factotum attributed to Pourchat. [48] Vie de M. Démia, p. 487. [49] Vie du St. J.-B. de la Salle, par Frère Lucard; Introduction, pp. liii. et liv.

schools, and even to the schools confided to religious communities and laymen.[50] But the pastors vigorously protested against this undue assumption of authority and strenuously defended the exception made in favor of their charity schools by the Bishops. This ruling of the Bishops was sustained by Parliament.[51] From this we observe the little schools which were dependent upon the precentor, the charity schools which were erected and controlled by the pastors only and the schools of the writing masters in which writing only was taught. Each kind of school was jealous of its rights and privileges. Now should the writing masters attempt to teach reading, or the charity schools admit pupils of the wealthier class, then the directors of the little schools, with the precentor, would have much to do about nothing.

Prior to the seventeenth century the government never interfered with the elementary schools. If it should happen to interpose the purpose was not to obtain control, but rather to ensure the teacher's salary, to erect new schools or to sanction the efforts of the clergy in this important affair. Such was the tenor of the royal decree of 1598, of the letter of Louis XIII. to the Bishop of Poitiers (1640) and of the declarations of Louis XIV. in 1685 and 1698.[52] The supervision of the moral government and instructions of teachers was left to the Bishops, who generally appointed an ecclesiastic eminently qualified for the office.

"The supervision," says Ravelet,[53] "was very strict. It extended to the teachers and the books. The teachers were warned not to teach the children of 'books of fables, of romance, or silly or improper stories,' and above all to avoid such as contained corrupt doctrine and teaching tainted by heresy. . . . But, indeed, we know the use and the possession of bad books were forbidden to everybody, even to private individuals. The children were supplied, as to-day, with primers containing letters, separate and in syllables, the usual prayers and the commandments of God. The cross shone on the first page.[54] . . ." The districts, fathers of families and private individuals continued to enjoy the privilege of founding schools and appointing teachers. But once accepted and appointed, the teachers had to be guaranteed payment, and their only personal duty consisted in the formality of obtaining the ecclesiastical authorization to teach.[55]

"The Church did not forget that in order to induce children to

[50] Claude Jolly, Traité Historique des Écoles Épiscopales, Preface. See also the interesting account by Ravelet, pp. 28 et passim. [51] Arrêt du Parlement ; Mém. du Clergé, t. I., p. 999. [52] Cf. Ravelet, pp. 49, 50 and 51. [53] Vie du St. J.-B. de la Salle, p. 154 et passim. [54] Brother Azarias, Essays Educational, pp. 185-194. [55] Ravelet, p. 52.

frequent the schools, it was necessary to let the expense of schooling fall as lightly as possible on the families of the poor.

"Free instruction has consequently always been one of the principal pre-occupations of the Church, not that illusory freedom which consists in making everybody, rich and poor, pay for the education of the children, whatever be the fortune of the parents; but really free education, that which rests upon the charitable foundations, and not on *concealed taxes*. Therefore does the Church encourage to the utmost the endowment of schools."[56]

If the Church encouraged the material aid to the schools, she was specially solicitous about the religious foundation. Hence when it was question of establishing a congregation or pious association, having for object the instruction of youth, the Church, in her generosity, showered upon the founder and his congregation many and great blessings and allowed them rare spiritual privileges.

With the thorough reformation of the clergy effected, it was, therefore, not surprising to see ecclesiastics of rare merit and ability devoted to the interests of the little schools, *i. e.*, to the education of the poor. Many attempts were made to found seminaries for teachers who would be well trained and disciplined and fully imbued with the spirit of their calling. Moreover, "the Council of Trent renovated the spirit of Christendom, and faith, purified and regulated by discipline, produced a superabundance of vocations." Nothing can exceed the fecundity of those congregations in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, especially those devoted to teaching. Among the first, therefore, who took the initiative in this sublime mission was Blessed Peter Fourier (1565-1640).

Having completed a brilliant course of classical studies at Pont-à-Mousson, Peter Fourier opened, in 1585, an elementary school at Mirecourt. We can appreciate his pedagogical aptitude from the declaration of one of his pupils. "If at my death," he says, "I find, as I hope, grace before God, I shall attribute that happiness to the fact that I was educated in my youth by the Blessed Peter Fourier."

After his ordination he entered the Congregation of the Canons Regular. He was afterward one of its reformers. He was made pastor of Mattaincourt, a much neglected parish. It was long left in disorder. "This worthy pastor was firmly convinced that neither

[56] Ravelet, p. 52. To-day we hear much about free education. This is unjustly claimed as one of the lasting benefits of the Reformation. The various Councils of the Church have positive legislation on this interesting subject. Let the candid reader study their decrees and he will be convinced that to the Church alone is due this precious boon of a free education. Her charity schools were free schools. The teacher was prohibited from exacting payment of the pupils. He was liable to dismissal for violating this rule. The councils are proofs positive and definitive. Cf. Ravelet, p. 57 et passim. This question merits careful study on the part of every student of history.

the reformation of his modest parish, nor even that of the Church and society, could be solid and lasting unless it were effected through the Christian education of the tenderest youth, to which he devoted himself from the moment of his arrival at Mattaincourt. This work constituted the principal object of his zeal. But what grieved him most was to see children excluded from the school because of their poverty and, again, because he met only mercenaries who were generally either incompetent or indifferent to disseminate the spirit of religion and Christian piety among their pupils."[57]

Hence, to overcome this obstacle, he formed the project of building two free schools, the one for boys and the other for girls. His aim was to facilitate the instruction of the poorest children. Alone he could not accomplish his object. He associated with himself, therefore, three or four men whom he carefully trained to be teachers. But the four young men soon abandoned him. "The work was reserved for another no less worthy."[58] And, "God reserved the success of this work for another holy priest who would prove more than a mere imitator."[59]

St. Joseph Calasanctius (1556-1648) conceived a grander and more practical plan than that devised by the zealous priest of Mattaincourt. He accordingly went to Rome, in 1592, at the beginning of the Pontificate of Clement VIII., and remained there till his death. He was the founder of the Regular Clerks of the *Scuole Pie*, or Pious Schools. They are, on that account, called *Piarists*. "The object of this congregation is to teach children reading, writing, ciphering, book-keeping and business transactions, the humanities, classics, mathematics, philosophy and theology. They extended to Spain, Austria and Poland."[60] In one of his letters, dated June 16, 1646, this holy founder declared that despite his ninety years the teaching of Greek to little children was a cheerful task.[61]

The Pious Schools were established at Rome in November, 1597. The Pope authorized Joseph Calasanctius to open colleges, direct seminaries and establish universities. The new congregation differed from the Society of Jesus only in this, that its members were connected with elementary grammar schools and were devoted exclusively to teaching.[62] "They did not spread, however, as much as was hoped, and, above all, they did not continue specially restricted to primary education. Their schools developed into colleges whose curriculum to-day extends from the elements of reading and writing to the higher branches of instruction."[63]

[57] Rohrbacher, Histoire universelle de l'Église, t. XIII., p. 137. [58] Brother Azarias, Essays Educational, p. 213. [59] Rohrbacher, t. XIII., p. 137. [60] Ibid, p. 74. [61] Vie de Saint Joseph-Calasanz, p. 405. [62] Everardo Micheli, Storia della Pédagogia Italiana, p. 152. [63] A. Ravelet, Vie du Saint J.-B. de la Salle, p. 85.

There were other similar essays, attempted at Lyons and Paris; the one at Lyons by the Rev. Charles Démia, and the one at Paris by the Rev. Nicholas Barré.

Charles Démia (1636-1689) was born at Bourg.[64] After he was ordained he went to Lyons. Here he was welcomed by Abbé Heurtevent, a Sulpician, who had established, in 1659, the Seminary of St. Irenæus. The contemporaneous writers were not flattering in their accounts of the spiritual and social condition of the Diocese of Lyons.[65] The celebrated orator, Massillon, in the funeral oration delivered over Villeroi de Neuville, exclaimed: "Alas! all the splendor of the city of Sion is obscured! . . . The faithful one who, during his life remained in profound forgetfulness of our holy mysteries and the law of God, dies peacefully;" for he was deceived through the ignorance of those who should have enlightened him. To oppose this depravity, therefore, the Archbishop, Camille de Villeroi, had founded or favored several important works; but "the little schools had not yet obtained his coöperation, being unmindful of the fact that society would be regenerated through the school."

Charles Démia was not slow in perceiving that the children of the laboring class lived in great depravity and ignorance. To apply a remedy to this crying evil he formed catechism classes and thus improved the behavior of the children.

On December 30, 1671, the Provost of the Merchants received many complaints, and was requested to listen, in behalf of humanity, to the earnest pleadings of the zealous priest and to give the necessary aid. Being at last touched at the sight of so much misery and vice, the Provost and City Council forthwith voted an annual sum of two hundred francs to found a school where the children should be taught reading, writing and the Christian doctrine. The following year three other schools were opened in the parishes of St. Nizier, St. Michael and St. Paul. In 1672 there were schools where children were received gratis.

But to complete his noble work and to make it lasting, it was essential for Charles Démia to associate with himself co-laborers who would assist him in carrying out his plans. He was fortunate to find among the clergy some very distinguished men who were willing to devote themselves to the regeneration of society. He was not, however, so successful with laymen. He saw, nevertheless, the absolute necessity to have complete authority over the teachers. Accordingly, he obtained from Louis XIV. a decree, June 7, 1674,

[64] Cf. L. Niepce, Histoire des Établissement d'Instruction dans le Départment du Rhône.
[65] Ibid.

ordaining all teachers subject to the regulations formulated by the Archbishop. Furthermore, it ordered every school closed within six months, if the teacher failed to legalize his position. Charles Démia looked upon thte formation of teachers as a personal duty and responsibility. He established, therefore, a seminary at his own expense for the training of teachers. He gave them rules and advice. The seminary was successively known as the *Community of Teachers, Little Seminary of Teachers,* and, lastly, as *St. Charles Seminary.*

The rules of this seminary were based upon those of St. Irenæus. To the superior were associated two professors—one for dogmatic and the other for moral theology. There were also twelve teachers, each having an assistant; they were all ecclesiastics. They left the seminary at an appointed time to teach school in the various quarters of the city. In establishing his seminary, Charles Démia had in view several objects: 1. To form competent teachers and good preceptors; 2, to prepare virtuous clergy for country parishes; 3, to enable worthy young men who had a vocation to the ecclesiastical state to complete their studies gratis.

Independent of the seminary, Charles Démia organized also a school-board, composed of a director and twenty-two rectors. This organization was approved by the Archbishop February 6, 1679. Among the special functions of the school-board was the direction and government of the schools and the administration of St. Charles Seminary.

The Congregation of the Sisters of St. Charles owes its existence to the zeal of Charles Démia, and its object was the education of girls and the care of the sick. This community is still flourishing. The seminary became, however, a common seminary like any other. The work of the Brethren of St. Charles did not survive their founder.

"The Rev. Charles Démia," says Ravelet, "had the intuition of the *mutual system of education;* at least he appealed to the good will of the older pupils, and established among them dignitaries who aided the teacher."[66]

Let us now see what was accomplished at Paris. Here we meet the enlightened founder of the Congregation of the Sisters of the Child Jesus, the Rev. Nicholas Barré (1605?-1683). This flourishing congregation had two distinct branches—that of Rouen and of Paris. The former received the name of Sisters of Providence, and the latter the name of Sisters of St. Maur. Madame de Maintenon

[66] Ravelet, p. 86.

at St. Cyr, Paris; Charles Démia at Lyons, and the Abbé Roland (1642-1678) at Rheims adopted the rules and regulations of Nicholas Barré and requested him to send them several Sisters to aid in the organization of a work analogous to his own.

But the tentative of the man of God in favor of teachers was ephemeral. He assembled in 1678 the teachers of Paris, gave them a regulation and endeavored to form them into a community. "The young men, however, thought more of themselves than their holy vocation. They looked upon it in the light of a useful calling, and so lost the grace to remain faithful to it. At the end of a few months they dispersed and their schools were closed."[67]

He was among the first to recognize St. de la Salle as the instrument destined by Providence to fill up, at last, in part, the immense gap left in the elementary instruction of the poor for lack of good teachers. He went even so far as to urge De la Salle to reside in Paris, where his disciples could divide the labors of the schools of St. Sulpice with the Sisters of St. Maur. A like counsel would not have been given to the founder of the Brothers of the Christian Schools, if the project of an association of the teachers of Paris had proved a success.[68]

But among the precursors of De la Salle, the ecclesiastic who evidenced the greatest zeal in the cause of Christian Schools was the Rev. Adrian Bourdoise (1590-1655). He was unquestionably one of the most devoted promoters of the little schools and charity schools. Experience taught him that perhaps the most effective element for the recruitment of the clergy was to be found in the wise and intelligent management of these schools.

"The little schools," he loved to repeat, "are the seminary of seminaries. But to render them useful to the family and religion, teachers should be formed who would labor like apostles and not like hirelings, looking upon the office of teacher as a miserable trade taken up to get their bread. . . . The best teachers, the greatest, the most esteemed, would not be too good for the avocation. Because the parish schools are poor and taught by poor men, people imagine they are of no account. And yet it is the only means of destroying vice and instilling virtue. I defy all mankind to find a better means. The school is the novitiate of Christianity."[69]

[67] Ravelet, p. 90. [68] M. Hermant attributes the founding of the Child Jesus to Nicholas Barré. This is an error. The religious habit he gives to them belongs to the Brothers of the Christian Schools. The disciples of De la Salle sometimes received this name, because the institute, as is proved by the Bull of Approbation of Benedict XIII., was placed under the special patronage of the Child Jesus. Simon de Domcourt, in his Histoire de l'Église de Saint-Sulpice, 1774, mentions the Brothers of the Christian Schools, called of the Child Jesus. [69] Vie de M. Bourdoise, MS., p. 985, 1203. Bibliothèque Marazine. Adrian Bourdoise de-

Adrian Bourdoise opened a free school at Liancourt which attracted considerable attention. While success crowned his efforts in the school, he was completely baffled in the attempt to establish a seminary for teachers. His ambition was to emulate the famous Seminary of St. Nicholas du Chardonet for the education of clerics. However, in view of the happy results which he obtained conjointly with Vincent de Paul and John Olier for the formation and improvement of the clergy, Adrian Bourdoise believed firmly that Providence would not long delay in giving to the little schools an apostle who would elevate them and give them a strongly defined Christian character.

Fully imbued with this thought, Adrian Bourdoise formed, in 1649, an association of prayer among his friends to implore heaven to hasten the advent of the much desired Apostle of Youth. "I believe that if St. Paul and St. Denis," he said, "were to come back to France now, they would undertake the important work of forming teachers in preference to any other work." Adrian Bourdoise possessed the happy facility of imparting his own enthusiasm to others. The association had already seventy members on its rolls. He placed it under the protection of St. Joseph.

"As the clergy are very negligent," writes Adrian Bourdoise, "in the instruction of children, God, who protects His Church, intends perhaps to remedy this defect by some extraordinary means and to raise up teachers who will conscientiously acquit themselves of our derelict duty. It is doubtless for this end that God gives to so many persons the spirit of prayer."[70]

There were already at this period many congregations of religious schoolmistresses. But as is evident from the writings of Adrian Bourdoise and contemporaneous records, no similar institutions, having for special object the formation of schoolmasters, either for the charity schools or the little schools, had been successfully established and operated. We have seen that all attempts to establish them proved complete failures. The antiquated individual method of teaching was scrupulously adhered to in the elementary schools. The reading of Latin was the foundation of the course. The precentor insisted upon the study of the Latin grammar, logic and rhetoric; while "in many localities," writes Mgr. Armand, Bishop of Angers, "the schools were hardly of any avail toward the salvation of the children, for the schoolmasters and school-

manded three things from his teachers and clerics, namely—vocation, knowledge and love. "The last," he said, "depends upon the disposition of our heart. It is the rarest quality to be found." He took for his device the two initial letters S. F., signifying *scire* and *facere*.

[70] Vie, MS., p. 896.

mistresses were content with the mere teaching of the reading of Latin."[71]

There was, however, a more serious abuse. The Church is the teacher of morals as well as of doctrine. We all know the frailty of human nature. Hence any one having experience will applaud the wisdom of the various councils and synods of the sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Indeed, we may also examine the prudent restrictions explicitly expressed in the councils prior, during and after the Middle Ages concerning the necessity of separate schools for boys and girls. And despite the strict laws and formal prohibitions, there still existed some mixed schools. "Although every one acknowledges," says Mgr. Hardouin de Péréfixe, Archbishop of Paris, "the utility and even the necessity of these formal prohibitions, we are daily apprised of their infringement in several localities, and which would have resulted in a manner decidedly prejudicial to the education of the children if we had not intervened anew by our authority."[72] Consequently, the Archbishop revived the ordinances of his predecessors touching this point and prohibited any infringement thereupon by schoolmasters and schoolmistresses under pain of excommunication *ipso facto.*

Toward the close of the seventeenth century this abuse had not yet been entirely corrected. The country schools at this period were generally known as mercenary schools. This was due to the fact that pecuniary interests necessitated "ordinarily the receiving of children of both sexes; it was rare, therefore, to meet with hirelings who dreaded this combination."[73] The King and Parliament of Paris enacted, however, upon this important subject-matter some explicit statutes and prohibitions.[74]

But the little schools, destined for the education of poor children, were deserted and held in contempt. There was a deep feeling on all sides of some existing evil. The schools continued to be deserted for lack of teachers who could take away the odium attached to them. Parents had no confidence in such schools. Therefore the great necessity of providing teachers above reproach and thus restore their good name and confidence. The success of the schools would then be assured and would eventually do away with mixed schools. The teaching sisterhoods increased and their schools multiplied. The girls had, therefore, no longer any need to

[71] Ordonnance Synodale de 1668. Statuts Synodaux du Diocèse d'Angers, p. 768, 1680. Also cf. l'Abbé Alain, L'Instruction Primaire en France avant la Revolution, etc., p. 109. "The Abbé Alain has made a specialty," says Brother Azarias, "of the history of education prior to the Revolution of 1789 in France." Essays Educational, p. 171. [72] Ordonnance du 10 Mai, 1666; Cf. R. de Beaurepaire, t. I., p. 72; A. de Charmasse, p. 140. [73] Vie de M. J.-B. de la Salle, p. 50, 1731. [74] Mém. nouveaux du Clergé, t. I., p. 1056 et passim.

frequent schools intended for boys. Hence by degrees the mixed schools even in the more densely populated parts of the city were of the past. This was an excellent remedy and it worked admirably.

There were, moreover, many children of every condition of life to whom the study of the classics would be practically useless. No one had as yet conceived the scheme of establishing a special course, having the vernacular as the basis of study, and arranged with a view to the new intellectual wants born of the invention of printing and the progress of industry and commerce. The demarcation between elementary and secondary teaching was nowhere definitively settled. Consequently a change of teachers not unfrequently implied a like change in the schedule of studies.

In studying the peculiarities of educational programmes of the period, we are not a little surprised at the lack of special schools where the pupil could take eclectic studies consonant with his future career. Hence even the children of some noble families were condemned to take the most elementary course, because they declined to follow the classical or because the father refused them the privilege to prevent them from embracing the ecclesiastical state or from taking up the profession of the law. In such cases the profession of arms was considered more honorable to the interest of the family. To-day we find special courses in every college or university curriculum. This educational reform was successfully introduced by St. de la Salle.

Men who had given any serious thought to the important question of the education of children concluded that seminaries for the training of teachers like those which had been established for the education of the clergy was the only possible solution to be reached. It was, therefore, essentially necessary to found a teaching congregation of select and worthy men, having for object: 1, The recruitment and education of men to fit them to take charge of large schools; 2, the establishing of seminaries for its teachers and the training of secular teachers. Is it not thus that congregations proceed to act when entrusted with the administration of ecclesiastical seminaries? They naturally form members for their own society and diocesan clergy for parochial duty. Under such conditions it would be easy to establish pertinent relations between the lay teachers and their forming masters so as to maintain in their schools unity of organization, method and aim. The teaching of the Christian doctrine would then constitute the groundwork of their schedule of studies, and thus all would labor for the welfare of society "through the

Christian and secular instruction of youth, the principal end and aim of their institute."[75]

From the beginning of the eighteenth century the government, the hierarchy and clergy, the public officials and the parents were unanimous in attesting that the work of St. de la Salle realized all and more that the most enlightened and far-seeing men had contemplated. Nor were those interested in the instruction of the masses disappointed, for De la Salle corresponded to all the hopes and aspirations they had founded upon the eminent merit of this great apostle of youth. The foundation of the Institute of the Brothers of the Christian Schools is dated from 1679.[76] But few years sufficed these patrons and promoters of education to warrant them in considering De la Salle the instrument of Providence granted in answer to the many and fervent prayers that daily ascended to the throne of mercy and love. De la Salle, too was the one destined to provide for their free schools such teachers as they in their piety and patriotism could have reasonably desired.

It is, therefore, "in the midst of this general movement in favor of popular education that De la Salle founded the Institute of the Brothers of the Christian Schools at the opportune moment of which the Church possesses the secret. The new institute set out with this thought that *teaching is less a career or instrument of fortune than that it is the most elevated expression of the spirit of sacrifice and devotedness;* and the Church has proved that by proposing the founder of this admirable congregation to the public veneration, she honors those who give their heart as the equal of those who shed their blood."[77]

But "never did the time," says Lemontey, "appear more unfavorable to the founding of a new religious institute." And yet, after enumerating the principal facts which demonstrate the corruption of morals and the consequent weakening of faith, he adds: "It was in the very midst of the symptoms of public indifference to religion that the Congregation of the Brothers of the Christian Schools is established. Struck with the neglect in which the children of the poor were left, with all the evil consequent thereupon, M. de la Salle conceived the bold idea of presenting these young savages to society by opening free schools where they would receive the first rudiments of secular and religious instruction. . . . He endeavored to accomplish the greatest possible good at the least possible expense. And we doubt very much whether his plagiarists

[75] Règles du Gouvernement de Frères des Écoles Chrétiennes, p. 12, 1714. [76] Annales de l'Institut des Frères, t. I., Introduction. [77] A. de Charmasse, l'Instruction Primaire dans l'Ancien Diocèse d'Autun, p. 41.

and imitators in many States of the American confederation have attained to a better solution of this difficult problem than did this pious priest."[78]

"The reign of truth is never peaceful. Heresy in a thousand forms is perpetually attacking her and trying to usurp her place. Just then, under the name of Jansenism, it was troubling the Church and was to go disturbing her for a whole century. At the same time Gallicanism, of older date and equally dangerous influence, continued its ravages, ensnaring Louis XIV., through his pride, and fascinating even the genius of Bossuet. The very year in which De la Salle was born, 1651, Dupuy published the new edition of his 'Preuves des Libertés de L'Eglise Gallicane.'

"Such was the period in the midst of which De la Salle was born into the world. He was also to be *the inventor of a system of teaching*. He was to receive doctrine in trust. He was to preserve it intact, to assimilate it by prayer and meditation and to distribute it around, and to find innumerable disciples who would go on distributing it after him. In this universal education, dispensed with such prodigality, there was, nevertheless, one class, the humblest and most numerous, that was neglected and left without masters. These were the little boys of the lower classes. It was to them that De la Salle was sent."[79]

C. M. Graham.

Tennessee.

A SUMMER IN SICILY.

MOST travelers testify to the potency of drinking the *Aqua Virgo* at the Trevi fountain in Rome to produce an irresistible yearning to return to the Eternal City, and the breathing of the air of Sicily seems to be possessed of the same mysterious power upon him who has once imbibed its fragrance; few can ever leave that fair island without finding themselves influenced by a warm desire to revisit its shores, drawn by a strangely powerful affection for a land whose recollections come back to the mind like some pleasant dream of the night.

To those who seek to make their travels a store of fruitful provender whereon the mind may feed in the afterglow of life, there

[78] Histoire de la Régence et de la Minorité de Louis XV., t. II., p. 287. [79] Armand Ravelet, Vie du J.-B. de la Salle, pp. 96 et 97.

are few places which provide so rich a feast for the memory. All true travel must be accompanied by a greater or less degree of bodily discomfort, but in the retrospect only the mental impressions endure, and our thought then will transport our unjostled bodies over the scenes of the past without fatigue or worry. Sicily does not demand any unusual share of this fatigue such as is commonly supposed to be necessary for a visit there, since the railway now makes all places that are of supreme interest easily accessible. At Palermo there exists every luxury of life and inducement to make it a winter and spring residence, and at other places there are to be found hotels which are at least sufficient for the traveler's needs. The brigand, that valued assistant to the newspaper correspondent, seems to have retreated before the advance of the parallel lines of peaceful steel, and is more likely to be met with in the neighborhood of Naples than here. Moreover, as far as we could learn in a recent visit, it is not the passing visitor that is the object of attention to the Sicilian highwayman, for there exists no band of these men, and the traveler has come and gone before any trusty number can be collected or any concerted action determined upon; but it is their own local people, such as the factor going from place to place collecting the rents, that is the real desire of their eyes.

In the combination of its varied history, its relics of ancient art and beauty of nature and climate Sicily affords a charm so great that Egypt occurs to the mind as its sole competitor, and even that fails in respect to the physical aspects. Yet Sicily is not uniformly beautiful; those who only know its fascinating and lovely eastern coast must not think that they will find it repeated. The mountains that girdle the greater part of the island from below the western Eryx circle round along the northern coast and turn again down the eastern to Ætna and give the land its picturesque aspect of configuration, for they leave but a small extent of level ground unbroken by spurs from the main ridge in the centre, and no spot is out of sight of these sheltering highlands. The honeycombed limestone and lava that prevail in their composition are the very materials to render a country not simply fruitful, but luxuriant, and to furnish it with varied outline and romantic spots, while from almost every point of view Ætna itself is visible and is a source of awe and wonder as well as of grandeur in the landscape. Above all the gorgeous sun irradiates mountain and valley, making them to "laugh and sing" in the language of the eastern Psalmist, flooding the panorama with every tint of azure and golden light from morn till eve, and defying all attempts to find a nomenclature of

color that will convey any idea of its varying splendor. The air is fragrant with the odors from citron and jessamine, fiery globes of pomegranate light up the thickets, orchards of orange and lemon with leaves of glossy green, gray oliveyards, vineyards of graceful native vine and purpling grape, to which the town of Marsala has given its name, the sombre carot, the soaring aloe, hedges of yucca and prickly pear, flowers and shrubs creeping down to the very shores or hanging in festoons and masses from the broken cliffs; in short, everything that can charm the eye and enparadise the senses is to be found lavished by Mother Nature about this bright island. The configuration of the steep and rugged coastline is equally lovely. The Bay of Palermo, with its guardian mountains like fortresses to protect its entrance, and the Bay of Catania, shadowed by lordly Ætna seated on his snowy throne, these are familiar from repute; but the whole coast is fretted by broad forelands of warmly glowing hills whose rocky barriers broken into outlying crags form deep recesses which echo to the whish of the sunny sea; masses of black lava rock, set amid a creamy surf, diversify the line of shore, while a rich flora occupies every nook and cranny and responds with glowing color to the opaline iridescence of the waters. But it is not only the senses of sight and smell that are captivated, for every spot teems with historic memories, appealing to our historic sense and intellectual capacity, deepening the enjoyment, so that one goes back again and again to the lavish bounty of the physical and mental delights of the island, as Cardinal Newman once said, like "as one smells again and again at a sweet flower."

No one who has read the great literatures of Greece or of Rome can coast the shores of Sicily or tread its strands without being thrilled with the evidences that remain of peoples that have "gathered" here and then "gone by together." Its Cyclops and giants of earlier fable were perhaps but the more prosaic workers in iron and stone, just as the Lotophagi of Læstrygones were the farmers and herdsmen of its prehistoric times; but they are scarcely less shadowy to us than the Sican Sicel of Elymian, whom modern historians identify with the island's earliest inhabitants. Each of these latter has at least left some recognizable evidence of his presence. It is true that of the Celtic Sican, Latin Sicel and possibly Trojan Elymian not a fragment of writing or coinage is known to us, yet of the Sican tongue we can shrewdly guess from the place-names that exist. Of Sicel there is known a short but efficient vocabulary; but of Elymian only a grammatical case-ending! The

subterranean cities and built towns of the Sican and Sicel have not yet received the patient study they require and deserve, but still they are to be seen. Fancy would wish to accept the presence of Troy's fugitives at least at the foot of Eryx, where Virgil tells of the death of Anchises and of the funeral games then celebrated. Here the island of the boat race lies in the offing. There the goddess mother of Æneas still seems to look benignantly on the children that play around the site of her temple and the pyre of her earthly lover, for they are still remarkable in the island for their beauty, and here alone in Western Christendom the women go veiled in compassion for man's frailty at the sight of their loveliness. But out of the sea-mist sweeping over the ocean of time and enveloping these earlier races we may descry other mysterious visitors to the island coming from the foot of Libanus and popularly called Phœnicians or in Holy Writ Canaanites. At first we can but vaguely trace the presence of these shadowy voyagers as they land here and there; but gradually they emerge into the light of history under the name of Carthage. Their own name, viz., that by which they called themselves, remains unknown to us. Sidonians, Tyrians we call these subjects of King Hiram; but those are only place-names. Who were they? will be a constantly recurring thought at many a spot. Those who have traveled up the Nile's flood will try and connect them with that wondrous picture on the walls of Dayr-el-Bahari in the plain of Thebes and think of them as coming from the "Holy Land of Phunt"—now said to be Somali-land—and find another confirmation of the general accuracy of Herodotus (vii., 89), who says they came from the Erythræan Sea. The Hebrew knew them as the Canaanites, *i. e.*, the Lowlanders, from their choosing the seashores and low plains in preference to the hills. The Greek named them Phœnicians from the encircling palm groves about their great cities of Tyre, Sidon and Arvad, which the inhabitants adopted as their emblem. The Roman corrupted this into Phœni and had to struggle for life with their more vigorous daughter Carthage in the Punic wars. But still their own name is a mystery to us. We may trace the sites of their factories, marts, temples and camps around these coasts and see their battlefields close by. Here they came to win the fair pearl of the great sea, at first as gentle wooers, spreading at her feet the luxury and wealth of the East and endeavoring to gain the favor of her glance by the richness of their purples, the delicacy of their tissues and the beauty of the embroideries for which Homer celebrates the daughters of Sidon. Their

descendants became less courteous and patient suitors, and adopting more violent methods tried by force to obtain her and to wrest her for themselves. Think for a moment as you stand gazing over some scene where once they have been that here came men of probably the same speech as Joshua and of David, the sweet singer of Israel, for although the Ægyptian was a "strange language" to the Israelite of the tongue of Chaldea, "one thou knowest not," we never find that said of the speech of Canaan. The Carthaginian names of Hannibal and Asdrubal that will be on your lips seem to confirm this, for we need only change the ending that tells of their patron deity Baal to that of the mystic Jah to see in those titles the familiar Hananiah and Azariah. These lovers of the low, sea-bordered lands came here from the foot of Libanus as they did to the old Irish and Cornish coasts, bringing with them those gods that had for worshipers the errant Solomon as well as the great Hannibal. Here they reared their temples to Baal and lighting their fires to Moloch made their children to pass through its purifying flames, a custom still recalled in the innocent mirth of the Beltein or Baal fires of midsummer in Ireland and many other places. Side by side with Baal arose the temple of the cruel Ashtoreth, with the scenes of lewdness that marked out "the abomination of the Sidonians," and here they gave the "fruit of their body for the sin of their soul." On some hilltop we find the Greeks, with their merry, graceful, "flashing-throned, immortal Aphrodite," born of the sparkling foam, supplanting the Phœnician Astarte with her passionate, insatiable hunger, and this again succeeded by the coarser Venus of the Romans, and in these successive dedications we may see the varying ideals of succeeding races in their conception of perfect womanhood before Christianity taught of her who was "Sweet Mother, Sweet Maid."

But if the Tyrian merchant were an unwelcomed petitioner for the love of the fair Sicilia, this cannot be said of the ancient Greek, for he surely won her heart. Subsequently rival nations, rival creeds, rival races, with rival systems of life, contested for a share in that love, for Roman, Vandal, Goth, Arab, Norman, French, Spanish were all aspirants and evinced their admiration of her beauty, and Arab and Norman were certainly regarded by her in no unkindly fashion, but the Greek alone possessed her. He made this his new world in the height of his civilization and culture, and his influence remains not only in the habits of the people, but in those evidences of his art which are among the most precious relics of Greek sculpture in Europe at this day. The Eastern coast lit-

erally teams with Greek memories, and it is this part of the island which is said by those who know both countries to be the portion that most reproduces the varied coast of old Hellas. This is the typical Sicily of Theocritus and the poets, with its mountains and islands, mysteries of ravine and cliff, its grottoes wherein dwell the Nereids, Cyclops-haunted caverns, inland woods and vineyards. Taormina, "la splendidissima," with the New Naxos at its foot, the home of the first settlers, and Syracuse, "la fidele," their last home, and one of the most magnificent cities in the old world, both lie along this coast. Towering above everything and dominating this entire side of the island rises mighty Ætna, within whose cauldron of fire is enclosed Enceladus or Typhœus, rebels against the King of heaven. Along its fertile slopes the goatherd still plays his pipes and his goats "run after the cytizus" (Theoc. x.). Silvery threads of rippling waters make music with the song of the cicada and the sweet melody of the pine woods; in the peasant's home the love charm and song of Simætha (Idyll ii.) may be heard, while on some purple hillside, fragrant of thyme and wild flowers, basks in the sun the old fisherman Œpis as he watches for the approach of the shoals of the tunny fish. So complete was the Hellenisation of the island that between the times of Thucydides and Cicero the native tongues had become extinct and Greek leavened the whole; nor did Latin, Arabic or French ever supplant it, but it continued through all subsequent changes until it gave way to Italian in mediæval days.

With the exception of Athens, nowhere, even in Greece itself, are such fine remains of that country's art to be seen as are found at Girgenti, Segesta, Selinunte and Syracuse. Some of the most magnificent temples that the Grecian architect ever produced still exist here, and a dominant desire in the mind of every intelligent visitor to the island is to see those that stand erect. To estimate the grandeur that marked two that are now lying like swaths of corn laid prostrate before the scythe of some giant reaper, a comparison may be made if the reader be acquainted with the lovely temple of Neptune at Pæstum, the ancient Poseidonia (about B. C. 550), which measures 190 feet long by 84 feet broad; or the matchless Parthenon at Athens (finished B. C. 438), which is 229 feet by 101 feet. These figures are entirely dwarfed by the measurements of one at Girgenti (the ancient Æragas and Latin Agrigentum), which was not only the largest in that city, but the largest that was ever attempted, unless it be that of Diana of Ephesus, for it was 363 feet long, including its steps, by 182 feet in width. Again, of

still greater length and little less area was the shrine they were constructing to Apollo at Selinus, which was 371 feet long and about 177 feet in breadth; but this was left unfinished, and one of those incidents which seem to bridge all intervening time may be seen there (such as occurs in the quarries of Baalbec in Syria or Assouan in Egypt), where the drums of the pillars remain awaiting the return of the ghostly workmen who were suddenly driven from their toil by the incursion of the Carthaginians in B. C. 409. Such daring magnificence shows the height of wealth and culture to which the Sicilian Greek had attained and may well excite our admiration and wonder.

But although the larger number of the existing remains of Greek art lie overthrown, yet there are three temples standing erect, while others are embodied in churches. These three are fairly perfect for work of such antiquity. Uncared for as they have been through centuries and only regarded with the eye of the spoiler or the adapter, they have survived the shock of earthquakes, the mordent tooth of the scirocco and, worse still, the lust of the utilitarian. Most of us want to see for ourselves what a Greek temple really looked like, and thus form our own conception apart from pictures and engravings, and here is our opportunity. It is a lack of school teaching that we have never set before our eyes as we read the model of a temple, theatre, bath-house, forum or dwelling place of Greek or Roman life. Pictures do not convey the reality, and the result is that we usually expect to see things in a very different condition. Nor are we wont to be familiar with the various parts and their uses, and this, added to the first sense of disappointment at their state of decay, often renders a visit to their remains unsatisfactory. It would be a good thing if no one were allowed to take the higher classical forms in our schools or become teachers at our universities in classical subjects unless he had traveled in the countries where Greek and Roman works are to be seen. A few months' study of these to a man already well read in their history is a duplication of all he knows, and brings a life and reality into his teachings that saves time and brightens the labor of the pupil.

All the temples in Sicily are in the style called Doric, from being perfected in the Doric cities of Greece, those first art schools of Europe. It was not confined to that tribe, but was common to all the tribes of Greece in Europe, just as Ionic was common to all the Asiatic Greeks. Like the Norman style in England, it is marked by its simplicity, solidity and impressiveness, and was governed by strict rule, simple proportion and pure harmony. The

temples are placed upon a stylobate or platform of three or four steps, and from it rise the columns without other base, with tapering, fluted sides. These shafts usually have twenty flutes and a height corresponding to five times their diameter. The form these edifices most frequently take in Sicily is described architecturally as hexastyle peripteral, that is, they have six columns in front and back and a varying number down the sides. The interior was built up by solid walls into an oblong quadrangle called the cella, divided into naos and pronaos, answering to sanctuary and choir in a Norman church. They all stand orientated after the custom of Greek fanes. The impression of firmness and solidity is very powerfully conveyed in this Doric order of architecture by making the entablature, as all the portion above the pillars is termed, intentionally heavier than was needful, and also by placing the columns near together and rapidly tapering. The frieze was ornamented with groups of sculpture, the rough surface of the stone of pillars, etc., was made smooth with a thin layer of fine plaster or stucco, and color would be used everywhere. Within the now desolate cella would stand some costly statue of the deity there honored, in bronze or marble, the work of some skilled artist, emblems of the god and statuettes of heroes or gods connected with him would be placed around, rich hangings covered the walls on festal days and sacred herbs strewed the ground. Every spot within the cella would be full of decoration and color, valuable votive offerings would adorn the walls, here the arms and bucklers of a conquered foe, there the prow of a ship in thanksgiving for escape from the waves, tripods of incense, altars and furniture for priestly use, vessels of gold and silver, all these we must bring back to our mind's eye as we tread these courts and repeople these shrines.

But the study of these temples would take up a greater portion of our space than we now propose to give it, and we return to a review of the eastern coast of Sicily as that most sought by the traveler in search of natural beauty and because physically and historically it is the most interesting. It is hard to compare lovely scenery and probably unfair to do so, but most persons will register in their memories the journey from Messina to Syracuse as perhaps the most singularly attractive and beautiful of any in Europe. Every form of graceful outline and every shade of magic coloring may be seen along that coast. The stupendous masses of mountains that overshadow it are broken into varying outline, never lumpish and heavy, but with peak and crest radiant in sunlight, while rift and fissure are deep in shadow. Their valleys, coming

down to the sea, have their sides clothed in luxuriant vegetation, pleasant streams wander down them from bracken covered woodlands, orchards of orange, lemon, pomegranate, fig and vine occupy every available spot, and where possible tilth and lea succeed dene and dingle. The oaks and pines of Theocritus are now rare, yet they still exist on the slopes of Ætna, but as a rule the mountains of Sicily are as bare as those of Hellas. The olive and the vine brought to the island by the Greek are gradually creeping up their sides by extended cultivation; the orange of the Saracen visitors is being more widely planted each year, but the palm that they also introduced is seldom seen, and more rarely still their cotton and sugar. The Spaniard during his possession gave the fair island the aloe and prickly pear, which he brought to it from his new world colonies, and they are continually met with. Since the time of Proserpine Sicily has been the home of flowers, and her mother Demeter rendered it the granary of Italy, and to-day it looks as fair and blessed with their gifts as when the virgin goddess gathered her violets in Enna's perfumed woods or when in union with Artemis and Athene she wove a floral robe for almighty Zeus upon his throne of Ætna.

The towns along this coast—Messina, Taormina, Catania and Syracuse—are each worthy of a visit. The last mentioned demands more than a casual one, for it was the most important city of the Greeks in the island and the most magnificent of its time in Europe. The remains of its ancient glory deserve a lengthened examination, and a stay of some weeks will reward the student of history. Its story and the enumeration of its ruins are too extensive a subject to deal with here, but it may be interesting to bring the reader up to its walls. Starting, therefore, from Messina we shall find that it, too, has much to say for itself, but very little to show. Its history is a long one, but political and natural convulsions have so disturbed the town that we should have to pick out a stone here and a pillar there to illustrate its long life. It is not at the extreme corner of the island, but some eight miles down, where the wash of the Tyrrhenian Sea, being met by the currents from the south, has hollowed out a bend in the land that resembles a reaping hook, suggesting to its early Sikel inhabitants their name for that instrument, *Zancle*. Refugees from Samos and the Peloponnesus, chiefly Messenians, changed this name on their arrival in the fifth century B. C. for that which we know, and from their advent its authentic history commences and interweaves itself with Grecian, Roman, Carthaginian, Saracen and Norman. Mes-

sina is throned against a background of castled rocks and pine-crested hills that wander into the distance, gradually rising in height and grandeur. There is not the spaciousness and scope about it that Palermo, its rival in commerce, presents, and the mountains press upon one from all sides save that of the sea. Modern commercial activity is not an attractive element in the beauty of a place, and the visitor after seeing the Cathedral will probably seek attractions beyond the limits of the town and revel in the lovely scenery that is afforded from its highlands. We may aspire to the extensive ranges of view afforded from the Rocca Guelfonia, again to find wild, conical, pine-topped mountains around us. In the private grounds of its villa are the remains of Matagrifone, the stronghold of the Norman Roger as previously it was of the Mamertine mercenaries of the Syracusan Agathocles; or upon the hill between Fort Gonzaga and the town we may stand upon the very camp of Hiero II. Indeed, from numerous points we may luxuriate in wondrous landscapes where the colors of the sea and the wild billowy range of the Calabrian Mountains across the water are thrillingly exquisite. The most readily attainable point of vantage, however, will be the terrace before the church and convent of San Gregorio, a spot well worth more difficulties than the tiers of steps and the intricacy of the narrow streets that we thread to take us there. Beneath lie the roofs of the town, beyond stretch the blue straits, with the Faro Point eight miles away north, the ancient Pelorus and the site of the famous Charybdis whirlpool. Two miles separate this from the granite crag of Scylla, standing off from the Italian mainland, behind which, spread out before our eyes, rise the Calabrian heights with the Piani d'Aspromonte. Straggling down the mountain sides or seated on the sea are pretty white villages or towns, the whole picture presenting a scene of great natural beauty and peaceful homely life. Turning southward we see Reggio, to which St. Paul came on his way from Syracuse, and up this strait we may recall how the "Castor and Pollux" bore the Apostle on his voyage to Rome. We may spend hours gazing over the fair prospect, varying with every change of light and most fascinating, whether we come when it is bathed in the amethystine hues of evening or when touched by the magic beams of the rising sun. At the back of Messina the hillsides are covered with vineyards producing the famous Mamertine wine. Olive orchards and orange groves abound, cactus, myrtle and arbutus cover the hill-tops, and among the valleys many an old Norman convent still nestles with cypress and pine rising from within its walls. We

shall not look down upon the town without recalling that it was here the Lion-hearted Richard spent the winter en route to the Holy Land in 1189, he and Philip Augustus of France fretting at each other's presence, and that within the walls of its recently completed Cathedral the former married Berengaria of Navarre, who came hither chaperoned by the wicked Queen Eleanor, his mother. Nor should we forget that it is at Messina that the whole of Shakespeare's scenes in "Much Ado About Nothing" are placed, and if we could locate the house and garden of Leonato, with its "thick pleached alley in mine orchard," probably of orange trees from Seville (on which the pun "civil as an orange" was based) we might easily picture the story immortalized by the English writer. Every one visiting Messina will want to see Charybdis, and drive to the Faro Point with that purpose. There is a severe eddy just outside the present harbor of the town, which some would have to be the circular current of which the ancients were so fearful, and which from its motion is called the Garafano or carnation, but it does not satisfy the proverbial saying, *"Incidis in Scyllam cupiens vitare Charybdin."* That off the Faro Point is certainly opposite to the rock, but its violence is now less marked than the one at the harbor mouth; still only lately a French pilgrim ship for the Holy Land was caught in it and sent ashore on the reefs, and scientific mariners have testified to its dangers, one recording that he had seen "several men of war and even a seventy-four-gun ship whirled round on its surface." The currents in this part are always severe and they are intensified by wind and volcanic disturbance, for since this coast is at the line of contact of the primary and secondary geological formations, it is upon the line of cleavage where the force of Ætna and Vesuvius are most felt; steam navigation, however, has become so perfect in our day that it renders most of these old perils harmless. Scylla remains the dangerous rock into which Circe changed the fair maid who had dared to be more charming to Glaucus than herself. The virgin's head and breasts, with the wolf's body and the dolphin's tail, are not apparent now to our prosaic eyes as they were in the childhood of the world, but the baying of the voracious and ravenous mastiffs within the caverns around her may still be heard as the hollows echo with the resounding waves. There is a remarkable natural phenomenon to be seen in these straits that few, however, are privileged to witness, for it occurs but seldom, and only at high tide at sunrise in hot and calm weather. It is known as the Fata Morgana, and is a kind of mirage wherein the Sicilian mariner sees pictured the erect or inverted towns, castles, palaces and ships of the

neighboring coasts. A very similar thing occurs at rare intervals on the coasts of Antrim and Donegal in Ireland, especially near the entrance to Lough Foyle.

But we must hasten on, for Messina is, as it were, but the gate of Paradise, and only the beginning of a coast drive southwards that exceeds all others with which we already are acquainted. If we go by the train we shall have to burrow fourteen times into the mountains during the succeeding thirty miles before we arrive at Toarmina, our next point of vantage. The scenery increases in romantic beauty as we advance; on one side we have rocky islets set amid opalesque waters, deepening into sapphire blue and bounded in the distance across the straits by the Calabrian Mountains; on the other, picturesque crags and castle-topped heights succeed one another in riotous profusion, and one wishes to stop at a dozen spots to let their extreme loveliness sink into the memory. In the railway it is difficult to know on which side to turn, both land and sea present such ravishing aspects. Inland broad watercourses down which the winter torrents rush are now, in May, dry and stony, and are being traversed by oxen-carts. They lead up into deep ravines in the mountains, with sides broken and rugged, but green with citrons and pomegranates whose fragrance fills the air. The Norman-looking castles of the Ruffo family, princes of Scaletta, and of the Alcontres, lords of Nizza, stand forth upon their rocky peaks; from many an overhanging crag hang masses of jessamine, in every rock and cranny spring blue and white lupins, marigolds and sea-pinks, while the constant variety of color of both sea and land brings an element into one's northern nature little realized in its intensity before. At the upper end of one of the many small bays that fret this coast rises the rocky throne of Taormina, and at its southern projection, now known as Cape Schiso, is the site of ancient Naxos, the scene of the first colony of Greeks in Sicily. Naxos is but the Doric for Nesos, an island, for to this outlying headland the strangers brought the name of their own Peloponnesian home. What Ebbsfleet was to England, that Naxos was to Sicily, as Freeman remarks, for from it, as from the Kentish strand, began the making of two peoples, giving to both islands their truest life and main history. The learned professor has lovingly traced out some of the remains of the ancient settlement, but for 2,300 years it has lain desolate; lemon plantations cover its site, and there is not much more to be seen than at Ebbsfleet itself. Imagination has to restore the scene, and fancy has to picture Theocles in B. C. 735 with his followers coming across this sunlit sea towards the

point that stretches forth as if to welcome the strangers from the East. In the light feluccas still used in the Mediterranean, in the egg-shaped caps and the loose surtout, with hood, of the sailors and fishing-folk, we may see much the same appearance probably as that presented by the early pioneers from Chalcis in Eubœa as they plied their oars towards Sicily. Here they set up the altar of Apollo Archagetes, and although there came in later times colonists to many another spot from different and often antagonistic cities, yet all recognized in this first planted shrine the centre of their national unity. Upon the destruction of the low standing Naxos by Dionysius of Syracuse in B. C. 403, a new town was begun on the northern side of the bay, upon the breaking cliff of Toarmina. High above this again, nearly 1,000 feet above the sea, was placed its acropolis, now marked by a ruined castle; ridge after ridge mounts first 700 feet higher to the hill of Mola, with an even still loftier background of stupendous and precipitous mountains that soar nearly 3,000 feet in air. Amid so much height and depth it might be thought that Taormina seemed a pigmy, yet it stands so clear that it affords from many points some of the grandest views in the world, and to those who have traveled much its prospect remains among scenes ineradicable in the memory. You may walk around the upper circle of its ruined theatre, truly the seats of the gods in a double sense; beneath you at one point in sheer descent of 400 feet is the immense expanse of the murmuring Ionian Sea; your eye looks down like that of an eagle in its flight along a coast stretching away by many a pretty headland and curving back as far north as Reggio and the shadowy mountains of Southern Italy, while Messina is just hidden by a projection of the coast line; through the broken arches of the scena you may watch the sparkle of the amethystine sea, and above the royal entrance in the centre Ætna rises, with its ice fields gleaming in the sunlight and piercing a turquoise sky with its silver peak; this alone is restless amid such a scene of enchanting peace and reposeful beauty that no words can convey its ravishment or painting tell its charm. Along the coast southward you may let your eyes wander to the dome that covers the body of the fair child St. Agatha at Catania, the clear air rendering it nearer than it is in reality, and further on you gaze over a coast where cities once stood bright with Greek life, until Syracuse in the distance arrests the interest from striving to travel further. We had the good fortune to be at Taormina when all visitors were gone; no worrying guardians, beggars or touts dogged our steps and the quiet life of the town was undisturbed. The beauty of the spot was penetrating

in its intensity, and one could not but think that the effect of living in such scenes must have influenced the thought of such a highly-strung, simple people as were the ancient Greeks. Life here might be like that in Eden, for earth seemed full of heaven and sin alone a discord in its harmony. Newman felt this in his visit in 1833, and wrote to his sister: "I never knew that nature could be so beautiful, and to see that view was the nearest approach to seeing Eden. O happy I! It was worth coming all the way, to endure sadness, loneliness, weariness to see it. I felt for the first time in my life that I should be a better and more religious man if I lived there. This superb view, the most wonderful I can ever see, is but one of at least half a dozen, all beautiful, close at hand." It was in the Bay of Catania during a rough, unpleasant night journey that he wrote the lines that bear the title "Tauromenium" in the Lyra Apostolica, which are wanting in "ease and spirit," as he says, from the circumstances under which they were composed:

"Say, hast thou tracked the traveler's round
Nor visions met thee there,
Thou could'st but marvel to have found
This benighted world so fair?
And feel an awe within thee rise
That sinful man should see
Glories far worthier seraph's eyes
Than to be shared by thee?
Store them in heart! Thou shalt not faint
'Mid coming pains and fears,
As the third heaven once nerved a saint
For fourteen trial years."

Toarmina is a place at which to stay for a long time if the traveler be desirous of restful beauty and comfort: it is an ideal spot for any one having reading or writing to do, or for convalescence from illness or worry. Its Græco-Roman theatre is the most interesting in the island, the Romanesque and Gothic remains in its silent street are attractive, walks up to the hill of Mola and climbs to Monte Venere are fascinating, and whether from the windows and balconies of the hotels or from every open space without, we can saturate our æsthetic senses in sweetly scented air, brilliant sunshine, varied color and dreamy landscapes. Both here and on our way South Ætna becomes an all-absorbing source of study; solemn and alone it towers above the great masses of mountain that surround it, "the pillar of heaven, the nurse of sharp eternal snow," as Pindar said. To those who have come from Naples with minds full of Vesuvius, it is like a giant to a dwarf. Vesuvius is little more than the height of one of these attendant mountains that stand at the foot of this monarch's throne. Mount Venerella itself is 2,900 feet, while

Ætna is nearly 11,000 feet, and is not only the loftiest volcano in Europe, but the loftiest mountain in Sicily and Italy. It is true that Vesuvius in comparison is but a modern volcano, its first recorded eruption being in A. D. 79, when Herculaneum, Pompeii and Stabiæ, etc., were destroyed, whereas the first authenticated outbreak of Ætna was in the days of Pythagoras in the sixth century B. C. Homer mentions it, but without reference to its fiery nature, and therefore it is possible it was then quiescent. Virgil, whose description of the Calabrian coast is singularly accurate, makes the Trojans see Ætna after leaving the Gulf of Tarentum, which indicates that its height then was much the same as now. Æschylus and Pindar were both at the court of Hiero of Syracuse a few years after an eruption and were powerfully impressed by it; the "rivers of fire devouring with their fierce jaws the smooth fields of fertile Sicily" as sung by the former is still a true description of its lava streams. Dominating the island without dispute, this terrible lord inspires awe from the helplessness of man to combat its forces of destruction and from the mystery that envelops its action; and it is still a potent factor in forming the peasant's mind of to-day as in earlier times. It is not locally known by the name of Ætna, but by that which we find in Dante of Mongibello. Its cone, high in air and glittering in the sun, looks like a diamond set in sapphire, and this is no poetic exaggeration of its aspect; the breath of the palpitating giants in its bosom, constantly being emitted in puffs of steam, warn the beholder of the peril that lies beneath its beauty; its awful presence both attracts and frightens, while its sublimity is made more fascinating by its incomprehensibility. From that snowy crest the goatherd on its sides has seen to flow the fiery torrent that burnt up the rich fertility upon the mountain's bosom, and with earth trembling beneath him and air resounding with the sharp crackle of appalling thunder the terrified peasant has appealed more confidently to the God of nature than to any earthly means of protection; as flame follows flame in leaping sheets of terror, and the shower of red-hot stones and lava fall about him, it is the prayers of the pure child St. Agatha that he asks to stay the devouring flood from his homestead and to be his covert in the storm. With such an abiding source of dread and yet of attractiveness it is no wonder that the people give ready ears to tales of marvel and romance, and it must always have been so. The Greek had the singularly wise habit of combining the gods and heroes of other religious systems with those in his own Pantheon, and he very probably applied this principle to the local traditions he found existing in Sicily. The

cycle of legends identifying the Cyclops and Polyphemus with Ætna is not unlikely to be a continuation of the old nature worship of the Sikel modified under Greek influence. Polyphemus and his one eye may be the embodiment of the volcano and its one outlet, his roars its rumbling earthquakes, his heavy footfalls the tremblings of the mountain and the crushing storm of hurled rocks and thunderbolts the work of his heavy hand. Or else it was regarded as the throne of almighty Zeus, and then it is Enceladus or Typhoeus whom the god has placed beneath his seat, and when these rebel giants turn from side to side the earth quakes, while their breath and cries are the smoke and noise. We shall find the same principle possibly true at many other spots, for the Dorian kept alive the awe of natural phenomena and the magic of rivers by this personification; made the little stream of Acis and the seaside pools tell of the Nereid Galatea and the love of the shepherd boy, just as the waters of Anapus and the fount of Arethusa at Syracuse repeat a similar tale. This allegorizing of the joy of waters and the making of each rivulet and fountain the source of graceful legend has a peculiar charm to the mind and introduced a poetry into life for whose loss we should all be the poorer. Modern music and song have given fresh life to the legend of Acis and Galatea, and along this eastern coast we shall find the names often recalled. Aci reale, Aci Trezza, Aci Castello and five or more other villages retain the name; the "sacred water" of Ovid's "herbifer Acis," formed of the blood of the fond youth slain by the cannibal giant of Odyssey, is identified with many an Ætna-born stream. Making its way out of a volcanic katabothron, it might well seem to flow from beneath a rock hurled by the hand of the parent of many an ogre in fairy tale; the Acqua grande or Fiume freddo rushes terrified to the sea as if from its power, while beneath the base of Aci reale, triumphant above the seven streams of lava that surround it, the fleeting stream hurries to sport with Galatea on the shore. She, too, has become a weeping fountain, and "with ever murmuring sighs and tears and watery spray" bewails her murdered swain. At Aci Castello we see off the pretty coast more embodied legend, for there rise seven huge masses of basalt and limestone, the Scogli dei Cyclopi or Faraglioni, being the rocks heaved by the blinded Polyphemus at Ulysses as he put to sea; the first flat rock near the beach, Isola d'Aci, contains a Grotta dei Cyclopi, but not the cheerful cave of Homer's description or where wearied Trojans took refuge. It is not Homer or Virgil, however, that is the companion to the student in the island, nor is it even Thucydides, Polybius or Cicero that we require just here,

but rather Theocritus, the native born, who has left us such a magnificent monument of Sicilian genius in the sphere of idyl and pastoral poetry. With delicate grace he faithfully describes the landscape and life of this eastern shore, and the freshness and modernness of his "little pictures" must be felt by all who read him amid these scenes. Who can see a shepherd on these mountain sides tending his goats, idly watching them as he plays his pastoral pipe or talks with some sun-burnt maid without putting into his mouth the words of the first Idyll: "Thyrsis of Ætna am I and this is the voice of Thyrsis. Where, ah! where, were ye when the voice of Daphne was languishing? ye nymphs, where were ye? By Peneus' beautiful dells or by the dells of Pindus? For surely ye dwelt not by the great stream of the river Anapus, nor on the watch-tower of Ætna, nor by the sacred waters of Acis." How redolent, too, of scenes here, although it be drawn of Southern Italy, are the fourth and fifth Idylls; the cattle straying among the young olive shoots, the driving of them higher up the mountain's broken side for grazing, and the goat running after the cytizus in the tenth. The song of the obdurate Amaryllis telling of the pinewoods on the slopes of Ætna, the old fisherman Œpis looking seaward for the tunny shoals from some vantage spot on its sides, the love charm of Simætha, are all graphically true to-day of life on this sunny shore. Often in the hot and dusty city life of Alexandria, whither he went, must the poet have longed for the "chill water that deep-wooded Ætna sends down from the white snow's midst," and been wistful of the rocks of Polyphemus and Acis flowing to a summer sea. He sings, too, of the love affairs of Aratus, to whom St. Paul refers as a witness to man's instinctive consent to the doctrine of the universal fatherhood of God, an author perhaps recalled to the Apostle's mind when he visited Syracuse three centuries later. It is in these pastoral songs that Theocritus shows his heart more than in the epics he penned to please Ptolemy Philadelphus, and the rural people and life of his Sicilian land are the fragrance of his canticles. Nor can we here forget another native poet, Bion, the "Dorian Orpheus" as Moschus terms him, who bids him, even in Tartarus, "Sing to the maiden (Persephone) some strains of Sicily, sing some sweet pastoral lay. She, too, is Sicilian and on the shores of Ætna she was wont to play and she knew the Dorian strain."

The peace, beauty and sunny radiance of this coast and neighborhood seem to naturally prompt to lyric verse and pastoral idyll; it would seem no surprise to see the Nereids dancing upon its shores or to meet Pan wandering in its uplands. The thick woods

of oak and pine are now few, but the banks of thyme and aromatic herbage remain. The sides of the mountain are overhung with masses of scarlet geranium, Palma Christi and yellow appled solanums. The joy of living is vividly felt and the heart finds its outlet in song and the body its harmony in a rhythm of motion. The city of this Ætna district is Catania, now the second in population in the island, and whose pride lies in its views of the mighty lord to whom, however, it owes the obliteration of all that would have rendered it of value to the classical student. Nor in our opinion does it present the best view of the mountain, for we think that obtained from the ancient Sicelian town of Centuripa, on the southwestern side of Ætna, to be the finer; and this, too, is also one of the most remarkably situated towns, being placed 2,300 feet above the valley of the ancient stream Simeto, upon an abruptly rising hill, which the learned tell us stood untold ages before there was any Ætna to overtop it! Still the view from Catania is superb, and the traveler will be sure to make a short stay there. Although only five years younger than the earliest settlement of Greeks at Naxos, the remains of its antiquity are buried deep beneath the floods of lava that have swept over it. Here lived the eccentric law-giver, Charondas, who made in those early days a statute which it would be well to see enforced in all Southern countries to-day. No one was allowed to carry weapons or knives in the city, and only without its walls were they permitted for defense against the brigands of even those times, as Diodorus tells us. Charondas offered an example of rigid obedience to the rule he had made by the sacrifice of his own life, for on some occasion, when returning from the country and being attacked by a tumultuous assembly as he entered the city, the mob espied his weapons upon him and cried out: "See, this maker of laws is a breaker of them." Charondas did not deign to defend himself, but replied: "No, by Jove; I die to maintain them," and then stabbed himself before them.

We shall seek for the tomb of the Sicilian Homer, Stesichorus, the blind singer of Trojan and classic legends, the perfecter of the chorus of the Greek drama, the lyric poet celebrated by Aristeides and Cicero, and of whose twenty-six books not three consecutive lines remain to us. He was buried near one of the ancient gates of the city, and maybe now beneath the Piazza Stesicoro. You have to descend eight flights of stairs excavated out of the lava to see the theatre where he ruled, and from whose stage Alcibiades in B. C. 415 harangued the fathers of the city when endeavoring to win their alliance with Athens against Syracuse. Upon its once marble-lined seats sat Licias and Lamachus as the honied tongue of

their orator was soothing Catanian suspicions. While the city fathers become lulled by the charm of his words, the Athenian fleet in the bay is not idle, but is demolishing a little gate, "which undertaking being completed," says Thucydides, "Alcibiades ends his oration and the Athenian fleet finds at Catania a proper anchorage for ships and men in the war against Syracuse." But one cannot enjoy a theatre by the light of a candle! nor find inspiration in a cellar to reflect upon the momentous results that followed the scenes it has witnessed. We might, too, recall the boy-harper Kalliches and many other historic names in connection with Catania, even down to the musician Bellini of our own time, for the city has been adorned with many celebrities and is still the literary and scientific centre of the island. We cannot pass by "la chiarissima," however, without a reverential visit to the tomb of the sweet child St. Agatha, whose tender purity did not stay the torturing hand of the Roman prætor Quintianus, and amid her cries of "Take me, oh Lord, for I am thine," her Maker received again the pure soul He had given. The Norman Roger I. built part of the Cathedral that now covers her shrine, and it is grateful to find here a tribute from the English King most beloved by children, the Lion-hearted Richard, who on his way to the Holy Land placed upon her statue the golden crown that it still wears.

The beautiful bay of Catania is more attractive than the city; across its sun-steeped waters, clear as chrysoprase, you see the headland that hides the great city of Syracuse, which draws one to it as the magnet does iron. Upon its now peaceful stretch of water that seems only to invite repose, Sicilian-Greek and Athenian, Roman and Carthaginian have had many a noble engagement—perhaps none more thrilling and picturesque than that in B. C. 396, when the fleet of Magon the Carthaginian here fought that of Leptius, in the battle of the Cyclopean Isles. Ætna was in full eruption; overhead hung its clouds of smoke; the shower of its ashes fell among the deadly combatants; the lava from its sides blocked with its fiery stream the advance of the Punic land forces! What a scene of human and natural agony for a painter's brush to portray!

After Catania the railroad runs inland, as if rejoicing to get free from the pressure of the mountains toward the sea, and we are borne across the ancient Laestrygonian fields, still, as of old, productive of the means of both food and clothing for the inhabitants, for both cotton and wheat grow here luxuriantly. The old stream of the Simæthus, now weary and shrunken to a rivulet, but formerly one of Sicily's most important rivers, marks the boundary of the

men of Catania and those of Leontini; and then after leaving on our right the malarious Herculean Lake, the largest sheet of water in the island, we come to the town of Leontini, the troublesome neighbor of Syracuse and one of the earliest Greek colonies. It was colonized from Naxos at the same time as Catania, and its history is singularly typical of the restless, volcanic temperament of these early communities—first an oligarchy, then a democracy, next a tyranny, said to have been the first ever established in the island; then came submissions to Syracuse, followed by rebellions against it. Indeed, to it may be attributed all the trouble caused by the Athenian invasion; as to Selinus in the West may be laid that brought by the Carthaginian, for in it was born Gorgias, who exercised so strange an influence over the Athenian mind and who induced that people to interfere with the affairs of Sicily. He was the tutor of Alcibiades, whom we have tried to recall in the theatre of Catania, and from this Leontinian-born orator and sophist we derive in unbroken lineage the political and forensic eloquence of to-day. He may be styled the Father of Rhetoric, and his style comes down to us through Isocrates, one of his most ardent imitators, upon whom was modeled the Latin form of oration that gives the strength and delicacy to modern metrical prose.

From Leontini the train again seeks the sea, following the valley of the ancient Terias, and from the lofty cliffs above Augusta we looked across the Bay of Megara to "Syracuse la fidele." Once along this curving beach clustering towns were seen, which now have practically disappeared, while inland is the source of the famous honey of Hybla, a term embodied in proverb. The name is vaguely given to the district more than to one spot, yet Melilli stands as the "*florida quam multas Hybla tuetur apes*" (Ovid Trist., v. 6, 38, etc.) The purple hillsides, covered with thyme and wild flowers, are still beloved by the bees and their produce still deserves the poet's song, yet the fruitful fields, the historic legend of the land and its sunlit mountains is a memory "Far sweeter to me than the honey of Hybla" (Ecl. vii., 37.) Into the Bay of Megara stretches the low-lying peninsula of Magnisi, the more familiar Thapsus, and here we come within the circuit of that wonderful city whose story has thrilled the reader of Thucydides. Now we take his graphic history in one hand as our guide-book; grounding the curved waters of Trogilus we pass beneath the Dionysian town wall of the Acradina and find ourselves at the island home of Ortygia, with many a delightful day's search before us.

Alfred E. P. Raymund Dowling.

London, England.

AN ESSAY IN PHYSIOLOGICAL PSYCHOLOGY.

JUST forty years ago Gustav Theodore Fechner published in German a book with the title "Psychophysik." Fechner defined psychophysics as the science whose object was to furnish "an exact theory of the relation between spirit and body and in a general way between the physical and the psychical worlds." The book was mainly occupied with the revival and development of some ideas advanced by Ernst Weber, a fellow-countryman of Fechner's, who, nearly a quarter of a century before, had made a series of observations on comparative sensations and the stimuli necessary to produce them, and from these experiments had deduced a law. This law, called by Fechner Weber's law, has been stated by Professor Wundt, of Leipzig, as follows: "The increase of the stimulus necessary to produce an increase of the sensation bears a constant ratio to the total stimulus." If to a weight of one pound held in the hand an addition of an ounce be made, the difference will be perceived; but if to a weight of ten pounds an ounce be added, the addition will fail of perception. Not a certain unchanging addition is perceived, but an amount ever larger as the original weight is greater must be added before perception is possible. The same law holds true for other senses besides the sense of touch and the muscular sense involved in the experiment just quoted.

Fechner's observations seemed to verify Weber's law. We now know that this so-called law is only approximately correct. So many conditions modify our sensations that the exceptions to the law are quite as numerous as the examples of its fulfilment. Fechner attempted to give a mathematical expression to the law, but his psychophysic formula, as he called it, met with criticism from the beginning, and now has scarcely any defenders. His book was, however, destined to become a classic because of the methods of investigation as to stimuli and sensation that it outlined. Fechner was a typically patient German investigator, and is said himself to have made and tabulated no less than 24,576 separate judgments in testing Weber's law for weights by the so-called "method of true and false cases." The methods thus employed have laid the foundation for modern experimental psychology.

Fechner's book is famous for another reason, however. In it for the first time occurs the term "physiological psychology," the

science of mind as far as it can be studied in the physical basis of the intellectual acts. Ten years later Wundt, of Leipzig, published a book, with the title physiological psychology, which treats of the relation of brain function to psychic activities. Shortly after he opened his laboratory of physiological psychology at the University of Leipzig. Since then the science has continued to attract more and more attention from year to year. Its cultivation has been taken up by all the great universities, and its study has to a large extent displaced metaphysical psychology.

Experimental psychology, which owes its present popularity to the stimulus of Fechner's book, is still inchoate and not out of its developmental period. The significance of the results obtained by observation and experiment is not yet agreed upon even by the experimental psychologists themselves. The investigations so far carried out are rather suggestive than conclusive, and do not form a coördinate body of scientific truth. Physiological psychology, however, inasmuch as it studies the physical basis of mental operations, has accumulated a certain number of interesting facts that may be discussed. As will be evident during the course of this article, it is as yet in an extremely unsettled stage, but the importance of the material it has at command makes even the glimmerings of great truths that are to be seen here and there amid the obscurities of the science a source of general interest.

As with all new sciences, exaggerated claims have been made for physiological psychology and its applications to mental problems. It would seem as though the experience gained when geology and chemistry and biology were in their developmental period might have enabled modern thinkers to discount these exaggerated claims and make them realize that the promissory notes of a nascent science are never to be taken at their full face value. Psychology generally, under the stimulus of the newer methods that have been introduced into the science, has shown a tendency to exaggerate its importance. Professor Münsterberg, in his essay on "Psychology and Education," says: "The good appetite of psychology has sometimes become voracity in our days, and she has begun to devour all mental sciences, history and social life, ethics and logic, and, finally, alas! metaphysics; but that is not a development; it is a disease and a misfortune." Certain unfounded pretensions of physiological psychology can only be considered in the same way as a misfortune. To quote Münsterberg again, (physiological) "psychology would learn too late that an empirical science can be really free and powerful only if it recognize and respect its limits, about

which philosophy alone decides." Meantime the attitude of physiological psychology, in its pretense to explain mental operations by physical factors alone, has made it an object of suspicion to many minds, to whom the truths of the new science would be welcome if they came in their simplicity.

Not all of the suspicion that attaches to physiological psychology is due to progressive physiological psychologists. The science is of such fundamental interest that there have been many dabblers in it who can scarcely be considered authoritative representatives of its principles. Scientists whose reputations have been made in other lines of investigation have sometimes been tempted into the expression of opinions with regard to physiological psychology that the psychologists themselves would have been the first to impugn.

A very striking example of this occurs in a recent book that has attracted a great deal of popular attention, Alfred Russell Wallace's "The Wonderful Century; Its Successes and Failures." Mr. Wallace's position in the scientific world as one of the great original evolutionists, assures for him a respectful hearing on any scientific subject. His last book would seem especially to deserve our reverential consideration, since it is, as it were, a great man's testament to his generation, his last word on the great scientific questions of the end of the century. It contains many striking passages of sterling appreciation of the scientific advances of the century and some very judicious pricking of its scientific shams, but it holds besides a most valuable lesson. That is that no man can hope to keep pace with modern science in its advance along all lines, and that even a really great scientist, when expressing opinions on subjects beyond his own special field of study, may fall into most egregious blunders.

Mr. Wallace's contribution to physiological psychology comes as a comment on phrenology. "In the coming century," he says, "phrenology will assuredly attain general acceptance. It will prove itself to be the true science of the mind. Its practical uses in education, in self-discipline, in the reformatory treatment of criminals and in the remedial treatment of the insane will give it one of the highest places in the hierarchy of the sciences. Its persistent neglect during these last fifty years will be referred to as an example of the almost incredible narrowness and prejudice that prevailed among men of science, at the very time when they were making such splendid advances in other fields of thought and discovery."[1]

[1] Mr. Wallace's opinion of vaccination in the same book is expressed with like force and directness. Because of the light it throws on his opinion of phrenology it seems to deserve

Needless to say, Mr. Wallace stands absolutely alone among serious men of science in holding such an opinion with regard to phrenology. His position would be especially condemned, if they deemed it worth their notice, by those who have devoted any serious attention to the study of physiological psychology. The opinion is mainly interesting, as I have said, because it illustrates the utter nonsense that may be talked by a really great man of science when he wanders even but a little from his special subject. Claims almost as absurd as Mr. Wallace's for phrenology have been seriously made for certain advances in physiological psychology, but fortunately the day of such shortsighted enthusiasm is gone by.

THE BRAIN AS THE ORGAN OF MIND.

Mr. Wallace's end of the century prophecy of the revival of phrenology is interesting from another point of view. It was the discussion over phrenology that, at the beginning of the present century, first called attention to the fact that the brain was the special organ of the mind, and as such deserved more attention from those interested in mental operations than had been given to it previously. We are apt to consider phrenology now as the catchpenny of the charlatan, and to forget that Dr. François Gall, its inventor, was a reputable physician, an intelligent and sensible individual, who seems to have been thoroughly sincere in his claims for the new science. He had long been a careful student of mental states and of men, and this system was taken with eminent seriousness by most of the savants of his day. The subject was brought before the French Academy of Sciences in a lengthy paper by Gall himself. Phrenology was rightly condemned, yet it has continued to influence the popular mind ever since.

Spurzheim introduced phrenology into England and America, and the system gained many advocates all over the world. The discussion it provoked and the popular interest it aroused had an influence absolutely unforeseen by either its upholders or opponents. As Dr. Henry Smith Williams said in a recent article in "Harper's Magazine:" "It popularized the conception that the brain is the organ of mind." This idea has remained dominant in the popular

---

quotation: "It (vaccination) will undoubtedly rank as the greatest and most pernicious failure of the century. It will be one of the inexplicable wonders for future generations that the delusion as to vaccination should have prevailed among men of science when progress in medicine was at its acme at the close of a wonderful century of scientific discovery." Comment on this opinion is unnecessary. The reputable medical profession of the world is practically a unit in considering vaccination the greatest blessing medicine has conferred upon mankind.

fancy ever since. It has been responsible for a good deal of the initiative that has led to the successful investigation of the relations of brain and mind later in the century. The story of the progress of the discovery as far as regards these relations constitutes the history of the modern science of physiological psychology, *i. e.*, the organized system of knowledge which studies mental operations in as far as they depend on the nature and function of the brain.

The first important observation in this subject was one of fundamental character made by Desmoulins. He pointed out that the brains of old people were of less average weight than those of mature adults. This is the result of the senile change that affects all the tissues of the body and causes them to be less succulent than at maturity. Desmoulins implied that this organic brain change was the cause of the characteristic slowness of mental operations in the elderly and the reason for their lack of initiative. His observations were embodied in a paper which was read before the French Academy. The Academy was, of course, composed of men well on in years. It is not to be supposed that they listened with equanimity to the young enthusiast who would lessen the reverence for age, and at the same time rob it of its dignity, by making its proverbial conservatism and slow deliberateness not a very commendable virtue, but only a necessary result of atrophic changes in brain tissues due to the progress of senility. Aristotle, we believe, said that man was in his physical prime at the age of thirty-five, and in his mental prime at forty-nine. A mediæval commentator on the passage says that recent graduates from the universities always considered this last figure entirely too old, while the old professors thought that Aristotle had put the acme of mental capacity in comparative juvenility. However that may be, the members of the French Academy waxed wroth at the impertinence of the young Desmoulins, and rather peremptorily refused to hear any further communications from him on this subject.

Desmoulins' observations were the first to connect definitely changes in the brain with modifications of the mentality. Since then we have learned how much the condition of the brain, its nutrition, the variations of pressure and of blood supply and the like have to do with changes in the mental activity. On the other hand, the conclusions drawn from Desmoulins' observations and from those of others who followed him have proved a source of not a little misunderstanding. Too much value has been attached to the notion that a definite connection existed between the general condition of the brain and the vigor and accuracy of the mental

activities. The conclusion has especially gained wide acceptance that there was a certain ratio between the size of the brain and the quality of the mental faculties. This is, of course, very far from the truth. The animals that are cleverest are by no means always the ones with the largest comparative brain weights. Among men, while brain weight often seems to bear a direct proportion to intellectual capacity, there are so many exceptions to the rule that it can scarcely be called a rule at all. It is not even true that man possesses the greatest brain weight, proportionate to his bodily weight, of all the animals. He is surpassed in this respect by some of the song birds and by the smaller apes. As a rule brain weight increases in proportion to body weight. This is true also among the animals; the elephant and the whale have the absolutely heaviest brains. In man the brain bears a much more direct and unfailing ratio to the size of the body than it does to the degree of intelligence of the individual. It is true that idiots have very light brains and that great scientists and thinkers have commonly the largest brains. All that can be said in general is that among the intelligent classes the brain weight is relatively higher than among the uncultured. The heaviest brain on record, however, is that of Rustan, an uncultivated Scandinavian peasant of rather meagre intelligence. The next heaviest is that of a moderately intelligent man of the better class, while the third is that of Tourgenieff, the Russian novelist, a great thinker, it is true, but still scarcely the man who would be picked out to head the list of supreme intelligences. On the other hand, the brains of some very intellectual men have been comparatively light. A well-known example is that of Gambetta, the great French politician, whose brain weighed only 1,100 grammes, though the average man's brain weight is about 1,300 grammes, and brains that weigh 1,000 grammes are found only among idiots. As some compensation for its lightness it was noted that the brain of Gambetta, who owed his political influence to his power as an orator, was especially well developed in that part of the brain which is known to be intimately connected with the faculty of speech.

BRAIN LOCALIZATION.

The most important contributions to physiological psychology have come from observations which demonstrate that special parts of the brain rule over particular functions. Gall's system of phrenology had set men thinking along this line in the early part of the century, but it was not until more than half the century was past

that any definite scientific progress was made. Flourens working at the Jardin des Plantes in Paris in the early '40's made a notable discovery. He undertook a series of experiments to prove scientifically that phrenology, the controversy over which had broken out again, was without foundation in nature. He was led into a series of discoveries which have deserved for him the name of father of brain physiology. His most interesting observation was that there was in the *medulla oblongata*, the bulb as it is sometimes called in English, a very sharply defined area, the slightest touch of which causes death. The *medulla oblongata* is the upper extended portion of the spinal cord, where cord and brain are united. This small point, the slightest injury to which caused death, Flourens called the *nœud vital*—the vital knot. It was thought for a time that all vital activity was concentrated here, and it was called the life centre. We know now that this important area contains the origin of the nerves leading to the heart. It is the interference with the function of these nerves and the consequent stoppage of the heart and not any fancied touching of the ultimate point of union of soul and body that causes the fatal termination.

The discovery of other such localized centres of special activity in the nerve tissue of brain and cord followed before long. In the '50's Claude Bernard demonstrated that there was a point on the floor of the fourth ventricle which, when injured, caused the appearance of sugar in the urine of animals. This we now know to be the site of origin of certain nerves that regulate the circulation of the liver. Flourens' work seemed to show, however, that there was no localization of intellectual functions, or at least of the higher functions of animals. Whatever activities were exercised by the cerebrum seemed to be accomplished by the whole of the organ, and not by distinct portions of it. The contradiction of this conclusion came from the observations of Paul Broca, a French surgeon.

In 1861 Broca presented to the Academy of Medicine of Paris his account of a case in which the main symptom of the brain lesion was an inability to speak because the patient had been deprived of his memory for words or of his power to coördinate the motions necessary to produce them. This particular condition, aphasia, as it is called, that is, loss of the power to speak, had been noticed before as a solitary symptom in a certain number of cases, in which it was more than suspected that its cause was some lesion of the brain. After being twenty years under observation Broca's patient died, and at autopsy proved to have an obliteration of the posterior portion of the third frontal lobe on the left side. Broca considered

that this pointed to a localization of the memory for words and of the coördinate motions necessary to produce them in this part of the brain. It may seem rash in the distinguished surgeon to have drawn a conclusion so important and so seemingly contradictory not only of experience, but also of the generally accepted views as to brain function, from a single case. As a matter of fact, however, there were other cases in medical literature in which it had been suspected and one or two in which it was explicitly stated that a lesion of the frontal lobes might cause aphasia.

No discovery is ever quite so unanticipated as it is sometimes thought to be by succeeding generations. Nearly always it is the culmination of a series of observations each approaching nearer and nearer to the truth. The master mind is needed, however, to get at the essential point on which a new order of thought rests. Broca's announcement aroused a great deal of interest. Within five years the claim he made for a centre for speech in the left third frontal convolution was substantiated by observers in various parts of the world. An injury to this region always caused at least temporary loss of speech. In certain cases the corresponding area of the brain on the other side seemed to be capable of taking up the work of the injured part. After some delay, necessary for the education of the new centre, the faculty of speech was once more acquired.

A very curious fact came out during the investigation of the subject. It was found that while right-handed individuals had their speech centre on the left side of the brain, left-handed people have theirs in the right half. The first bit of knowledge of cerebral localization gained in very early times had been drawn from the fact that a hemorrhage or injury to one side of the brain always caused a paralysis of the opposite side of the body. The right side of the body is, as a rule, more used and consequently is better developed than the left side. It was not surprising, then, to find that it was in the hemisphere of the brain controlling this side of the body that the centre for the intricate and important faculty of speech was localized. The confirmation of this hypothesis furnished by the fact that in left-handed men a lesion which caused loss of speech was practically always on the right side was a most welcome contribution to the subject that seemed to substantiate the whole theory of localization very completely. The first cases of aphasia with a right-sided brain lesion that were reported seemed to militate against the conclusion of a uniformly one-sided speech centre, but the concomitant left-handedness of these cases served to make the new doctrine of localization more triumphant than ever.

There began now a series of interesting experiments that demonstrated the existence in the cortex of the brain of certain more or less sharply defined areas, each one of which seemed to rule over the motions of a particular part of the body. In the early '70's Fritsch and Hitzig applied electrical currents to various parts of the brain cortex, and found that the stimulation thus produced was responded to by movements of certain parts of the opposite side of the body. The conclusion they drew from their observations was that there existed certain brain centres ruling over the motion of various members and parts of the body. Their conclusion was received with almost universal skepticism at first. The subject was taken up for investigation in many places, but only with the effect of completely substantiating Fritsch and Hitzig's results. François Franck in France, Munck and Goltz in Germany and Horsley, Ferrier and Schaeffer in England repeated the experiments of stimulating the brain cortex of animals with various modifications of technique, but with surprisingly uniform results.

Little likely as it seemed to be at first and unacceptable as the doctrine was to all who thought of the brain cortex as of higher moment than merely to act as motor centres for the production of simple muscular contraction, the conclusion seemed inevitable. The cortical area of the brain was mapped out after most minute and repeated observations. The anterior part of the cerebrum, the frontal lobes of the brain lying just behind the forehead, gave absolutely no response to electrical stimulation, and were called the silent convolutions. Immediately behind these convolutions occurs the most prominent fissure of the cerebral cortex. Beginning at a point somewhat behind the middle point of the cerebrum, it runs from the great fissure that divides the cerebrum into two almost equal hemispheres downward and slightly forward, ending anteriorly to the middle of the cerebrum. It thus divides the lateral surface of the hemisphere into two approximately equal parts. Two large and important convolutions lie along this fissure, which used to be called the Rolandic fissure, after Rolando, its discoverer, but which is now generally known as the central fissure. The convolution that lies anteriorly to the central fissure is known as the precentral gyrus, or convolution, the one lying posteriorly being known as the post central gyrus.

Fritsch and Hitzig's experiments showed that in these two central gyri were situated the cortical centres that preside over movements in various parts of the body, that is to say that there were here definite and rather sharply defined areas of gray matter, the stimula-

tion of which caused convulsive movement and the removal of which led to paralysis of various parts of the body. The nervous substance that presided over the movements of facial muscles lies just behind the speech centre in the third frontal convolution in the lower part of the precentral and post central gyri. Above this facial cortical area lies the centre for the arm, and still higher at the vertex of the hemispheres the leg centre.

For a good many years this crude, simple doctrine of motor centres occupying the major part of the brain cortex was the accepted teaching of the schools of neurology and anatomy. That it was absolutely true seemed to be demonstrated by the fact that the diagnosis of the presence of a lesion of the cerebral cortex could be made from the observation of the muscles that were affected. These localizing symptoms as they were called became a most important factor in diagnosis for cerebral surgery. When an injury happened to the head, for instance, though there were no external signs on the skull, the location of the injury to the brain could be often picked out with almost absolute certainty and the surgeon directed where to look for the lesion. Brain tumors were located very exactly by the same method. It was the custom to operate more for epilepsy some years ago than it is now. Experience has shown, unfortunately, that the beneficial effect of such operations is only temporary. The surgeon was always directed in these cases, when operation was decided upon, by the muscles that were especially affected during the epileptic convulsion. The aura of an epileptic attack, that is, the preliminary muscular twitching or peculiar sensation that precedes the attack, usually occurs in the muscle or sense organ, whose cortical cerebral nerve supply is most affected by the lesion that causes the epilepsy. Despite these confirmations by actual dissection and demonstration in the living subject of the doctrine of motor cortical nerve centres, the teaching proved to be very incomplete in the light of later observations.

When portions of the brain cortex were affected it was soon noted, though only in isolated cases at first, that besides motor functions sensation was also disturbed. Gradually more and more careful observations seemed to show that these so-called motor centres were also sensory centres. The impression is now gaining ground that these cortical centres are something far more than merely sensory or motor spheres of function, or even a combination of these. They represent the higher order of nerve centres that rule over all the lower centres. They are the storehouse of the physical effects of the interaction of sensory and motor nerve stimuli which makes the

accomplishment of an action easier after its repeated performance. They represent the series of cell changes, chemical and physical, which makes for the facility acquired from habit.

Careful observation in a great many cases has shown that the effect of precisely similar lesions is by no means always the same in different individuals. A lesion of Broca's convolution. the third frontal, does not always produce simple motor aphasia to the same extent. Charcot pointed out that the memory for words differs in different individuals. Some recall words by their sound, to some the mental picture of a word is always the written or printed image of it, while there are those who remember them by the group of motions made for their articulation, and still others by the movements required to write them. These four classes of persons, whom Charcot has called the auditory, visual, articulo motor and grapho motor types, acquire their facility of speech in different ways, and the disturbance of speech is consequently manifested in varying causes. Broca's centre presides especially over articulation, and a lesion here would affect most the articulo motor type of person. Just behind and above Broca's centre in the cerebrum is the centre for the arm, still further back the auditory and visual centres, all of them being more or less closely connected with each other. All of these centres together constitute the speech area, and lesions that affect this part of the brain cortex or the fibres leading from it will affect the faculty of speech in various ways. The extent of the disturbance will depend on the character of the individual's memory for words and the image that is called up by his mind before he reproduces them.

In a word, there are, besides the absence of the simplicity of mechanism at first thought to preside over speech, some positive factors in the reproduction of words that take this important faculty out of the realm of the merely mechanical entirely. There is, besides the cellular factors that preside over the various elements that make speech possible, a definite relation between the cells and the various parts of the brain in which they lie which modifies and regulates the speech faculty, making it not a mechanical action, the same in every individual, but a something special for each person. Fancied simplicity of mechanism has given way to the realization of its great complexity. The obvious suggestion obtrudes itself even from consideration of the physical facts alone that there is a mysterious force behind the mechanism that coördinates its various parts and, while preserving the individuality, yet gives a series of results in the communication of ideas to others that seem to be exactly the same as

those exhibited by every other human being, yet are eminently personal.

As to the localization of the higher intellectual faculties, at one time considered to be definitely settled, recent observations serve to show that these are something entirely apart from cortical areas or cerebral centres. The frontal lobes of the brain, the silent convolutions, for the added reason that injury to them as a rule sets up no symptoms that can lead to the location of the lesion, were claimed by eminent authorities to be the seat of the intellectual faculties. The idea received such wide diffusion that it is still referred to in popular discussions of mental physiology as if it were an acquired fact. It is one of those bits of popular science that are apt to be so misleading. There was never anything more than the merest conjecture to support the theory of such a localization. One of the best known of the rising generation of physiological psychologists in Germany, Professor Ziehen, of Jena, has recently summed up the present position in the matter. "The hypotheses," he says, "which ascribe a relationship of the frontal lobes to higher psychic processes, to a hypothetical apperception (Wundt) or to 'character' cannot any longer be accepted. We now know that grave lesions of the frontal lobes may take place without interference with these attributes, while on the other hand anomalies of apperception and character have been observed in all kinds of lesions of the cortex, no matter what their location."

PATHOLOGICAL PSYCHOLOGY.

Pathology, the science of disease, proved so helpful for the development of physiology, the science of function, in other parts of the body, that it was hoped it would prove of service with regard to higher brain functions. This hope was strengthened by the fact that the study of nervous diseases aided greatly in the elucidation of difficult problems with regard to the function of nervous tissue. Disease by eliminating certain of the factors that enter into function simplifies the question of its why? and how? and frequently calls attention to quite unexpected elements that enter into it. In general, however, pathology has proved disappointing in what it has been able to give to psychology. The well-known ordinary types of mental disease, mania and melancholia, present no characteristic lesions of the brain. It might be thought that the serious disturbance of intellectual function they involve would surely be associated with marked changes in the cerebral substance. No uniform patho-

logical conditions have, however, been found *post mortem* in these cases. In some brains a thickening of the membranes is found. In certain of the chronic insanities the skull bones are thickened, and bony plates are found in the dura or outer membrane of the brain. Cystic formations in the middle layer of the membranes have frequently been noticed. Certain sclerotic changes, that is, processes of hardening, are often reported, as also coloid degeneration of nerve fibres.

All of these changes have been reported, however, in cases in which absolutely no anomalies of intellectual activity had been noted during life. On the other hand, cases of intense intellectual disturbance, chronic as well as acute and persistent up to the moment of death, have been noted in many cases without any unusual appearance of the brain or membranes being found at the autopsy to account for them. Like the delirium of fever, these mental diseases are supposed to be due to functional changes in the brain tissues, that is, to nutritive and metabolic disturbances of brain cells, but not to substantial enduring changes in them that can be recognized by any means we have at our command at present. The same thing is true for the delusional states paranoia, hysteria, etc., and even in most cases for epilepsy. Usually these disorders occur in families, and in varying degrees or in their equivalents they may be traced in generation after generation, yet no sign can be found in the brain of any cause for them.

It is different for the dementias. While extremest mental aberration may run its course without the slightest alteration in brain tissues being demonstrable by any known method, failure of mental power is practically always accompanied by gross lesions of the cerebral cortex that are comparatively easy to find. Sclerotic changes are very common in these conditions, that is, there is an over development of connective tissue, with disappearance of true nervous tissue. There is always a lessening of the blood supply, due to the fact that the connective tissue around the blood-vessels increases in amount and so causes a diminution of their lumen and consequently of their blood capacity. The nerve cells of the cerebral cortex are, as might be expected, very much affected by this lowering of their nutritive supply. Some of them disappear completely; some remain only as detritus in the midst of the connective tissue; a few retain the character of cells, but are so much altered in structure that it is easy to understand that their function must be seriously interfered with. This is, of course, the pathological picture presented by advanced dementia. Milder types with less marked alter-

ations are often seen. In fact, senile change in the brain is one of these milder types, and the gradual diminution of intellectual acumen that accompanies it is well known.

There are certain pathological conditions in the brain that cause marked disturbances of intellection. The presence of a tumor, for instance, when it does not cause such intense constitutional symptoms as absolutely inhibit all normal expression of feeling, may cause a marked change of disposition. It may make of an easy-going, quiet-tempered man a querulous, difficult individual, with whom it is extremely hard to get along. All this, of course, before the appearance of any sure physical sign of its presence. It has been noted that a tumor pressing upon the frontal lobes of the cerebrum may cause a tendency to the constant repetition of little witticisms. This symptom, called by the Germans Witzelsucht, "the little joke disease," has been noted so frequently that it is now looked upon with considerable confidence as a good diagnostic sign of the localization of a tumor when other characteristic symptoms of a tumor's presence are to be found. It will make most of us a little more charitable towards the far-fetchers of little jokes to realize that it may not be their fault, but their misfortune, and that their annoying peculiarity is really due to a local excess of pressure on their frontal regions.

Certain diseases by affecting special parts of the nervous system have given us some very interesting side lights on the manner in which we acquire our ideas. For instance, since cold is nothing in itself but only a negation of heat, it might be thought that we derived our notions as to relative heat or cold through the same set of nerves, and that it was a question merely of quantity not quality of stimulus that enabled us to distinguish between heat and cold. There is a disease of the spinal cord, however, syringomyelia, in which sometimes while the sensation for heat is lost that for cold remains. Patients may burn their fingers unawares and yet be very sensitive to cold in the same parts. This has led to careful investigation of the subject of heat and cold perception. By actual experiment it was found that there exist in the skin definite areas for heat and cold perception. These are quite distinct from each other, though their boundaries frequently overlap and probably represent the distribution of special terminal nerve endings.

One of the most interesting features of pathological psychology has been the question of heredity. That there is no heredity of acquired characteristics of any kind in immediately succeeding generations is now pretty generally conceded. There undoubtedly ex-

ist in certain families, however, easily recognized tendencies to mental troubles, and these recur in generation after generation. It has been hoped to connect these with some definite anomalies of brain tissue. There are those who, like Lombroso, think that they are able to point out even certain easily perceived arrangements of cerebral convolutions that are usually associated with mental aberration, degeneracy and moral disequilibration. The whole subject is as yet extremely dubious, however. There are certainly changes in the brain tissue that have an influence on the moral sense. The sclerotic changes that mark the beginning of general paralysis of the insane undoubtedly are the cause of the exaggerated feeling of self-importance, the neglect of the distinction between meum and tuum and the sexual divagations that characterize the initial stage of the disease. The failure of moral principles in the idiot is due to the absence of brain development. The soul cannot work through an imperfect physical organ. Neurologists have come to the conclusion that certain definite changes in the brain substance are associated with alterations of the disposition of the mentality. To the student of brain pathology it would seem as though the individuality of men was due to their brain structure, the spiritual source of energy behind matter being equal in all cases. This doctrine of the equality of souls is, I understand, the explicit teaching of St. Thomas.

It is easy to understand, then, how a theory of heredity in mental qualities may be evolved. The child inherits very often the features of either parent to a marked extent. It is easy to trace parental resemblances in the eyes or nose or mouth, in the shape of the jaw and forehead and ear. The stature and build of a parent and child are often closely similar. It would not be surprising if a corresponding similarity of brain tissue should exist between the child and its progenitors. If the conformation of the nose and mouth and ear are similar, why not also that of the convolutions of the brain? If the cerebral lobes that are more intimately connected with some special sense, as hearing or sight, are larger than normal in father or mother, or have a special form that modifies their function, why not also in the child? The external organs bear a resemblance, why not the internal organs? We know that certain changes in the brain tissue may influence the moral sense, the disposition and the mentality. It is probable, then, that variations in the size and form and arrangement of the brain tissue that is given to each individual at conception and by development may have much to do with his character and mental capacity and activity. The inheritance of qualities seemingly beyond the range of matter is thus explained because

of the physical basis on which rest spiritual manifestations in the present order of things.

This predicates an inborn weakness or strength of character in certain cases, and so may seem to trench on the freedom of the will. Nothing is surer, however, than that all men are not born equal as regards their will power. This is generally acknowledged, and the expressions "weak-willed," "strong-willed" have become ineradicable parts of the language. Differences in the moral sense that are independent of the individual and that are due to his "make up" are also acknowledged. Some people are naturally good, some prone to evil; some are religious by nature, some not. These qualities do not destroy the free will of the individual, but they make the accomplishment of certain acts easier or harder, according to circumstances. They add to or take away from the merits of a certain course of life according to the individual. Our practical application of the principle that certain irregularities of life may be dependent on the inherited physical basis of character is the doctrine now universally accepted by medical men, that the children of neurotic, paranoiac and insane parents should be most carefully guarded from all nervous and emotional excitement and from over work. Their physical condition must also be faithfully cared for and always kept as far as possible at the very acme of well being. Failure of bodily health will almost surely involve mental deterioration.

Pathology's contributions to physiological psychology constitute some of the most suggestive materials that the new science has obtained for its future structure. From the very nature of the conditions under which this material is secured, however, its ultimate usefulness is as yet a matter of doubt. The general influence of diseased conditions of the brain on intellectual processes has long been known. The detailed knowledge of recent years is full of promise that the relations of mind and body in their highest functions will be better appreciated by further extension of that knowledge. The mystery of the ultimate processes within the cell is as yet hidden all over the body. It can scarcely be hoped that brain cells will yield any of their secrets to investigators before the physiology of simpler cells has been made much clearer than it is at present.

PSYCHOLOGY AND MINUTE BRAIN ANATOMY.

The investigation of brain tissues very early in the study of brain anatomy led to the conclusion that the cells were important elements in the brain substance. For many years, however, it was thought

that the network of fibres that makes up the white interior substance of the brain constituted the organ of mind. The association theory by which consciousness was supposed to be the result of the intimate connection of different parts of the brain with each other was for a long time very popular. This theory supposed that all the brain cells of a particular portion of the brain were connected with the cells of every other portion. The meshwork of fibrils in the white substance of the brain was supposed to represent the intercellular connecting links. Whether there was direct connection between any two fibres in their course within the brain was a mystery, though such connections were supposed to exist. The structure of the brain was too intricate for the cruder methods of the early days even of advancing histology to resolve it into its elements with any success.

Much was accomplished by staining methods. Much more ground in the minute anatomy of the brain was gained after the introduction of the microtome, which enabled the investigator to obtain for observation extremely thin sections of tissues and so to use higher powers of the microscope for their study. Besides, he was enabled to follow in serial sections, that is, in successive cuts from the tissue, the various special appearances that were detected in this way to find out with more assurance their significance in the scheme of brain tissue. As a matter of fact for minute anatomy the microtome has been almost of more importance than the microscope. Brain tissue was so lacking in consistency, however, that various hardening agents had to be used to enable it to be cut in sufficiently thin sections with the microtome. The effect of these substances was to obscure normal conditions, and for a long time minute brain anatomy was practically at a standstill because of the difficulties involved.

The important advances in methods of examination that were to lead to a complete change of view with regard to the fibres and cells of the brain and strike a death-blow at the association theory came not from the Germans, who had done so much work in histology, but curiously enough from two Latin countries. The most important discovery of the century in minute brain anatomy was the work of a Spaniard, Ramon y Cajal. Despite the presumable unlikelihood of such a thing, the distinguished discoverer has succeeded in gathering around him a school of progressive young Spaniards, among whom his brother is the best known, who are very ably seconding his efforts, and who, under the guidance of their master, are doing work that is attracting the attention of the whole medical and psychological world

About fifteen years ago Dr. Camillo Golgi, an Italian microscopist well known for his researches on malaria, invented a new method of staining brain tissue. The principal agent in the new method was nitrate of silver. With this substance Golgi succeeded in so staining nerve cells and the branches running from them that he was able to follow them with assurance to their terminations. He succeeded in demonstrating that all the so-called protoplasmic processes of the nerve terminated in a tuft of branches. The tree-like appearance of these branched processes gave rise to the name dendrites. These branches of the cells are not continuous with the branches from other cells. They have no direct connection with any but a single cell. The axis cylinder of the nerve cell was a much larger branch than any of the others. It was along this that nervous impulses were supposed to flow. Golgi did not succeed in tracing this branch to its termination, so that he left the question open whether this branch did not form a direct path of communication between different cells. Golgi's work made nerve fibres of much less importance than they had been. Certain ideas in pathology had exaggerated the value of the nerve fibre at the expense of the nerve cell. It had been noted that nerve fibres degenerated when the cell to which they were attached was seriously injured. The cell was said to exert a trophic influence on the nerve fibre that is somehow to transmit to it the vital stimuli which kept it alive. Now, it was realized that the fibre was only a part of the cell, a prolongation of it for a special function, and, of course, died with the rest of the cell.

The work on the minute anatomy of the brain which was destined to influence psychology most was yet to come from the young Spanish histologist, who modified Golgi's methods for his investigations. Ramon y Cajal succeeded in demonstrating that not even the axis cylinder of the nerve cell is in direct connection with any other nerve cell. The axis cylinder, like the other cell branches, ends in absolutely free extremities. All of its collateral branches terminate the same way. Each nerve cell is a separate entity. The nervous substance of the brain, then, instead of being a complicated meshwork of cells and nerve fibres connected together, is composed of a mass of cells with their prolongations, but all of them absolutely separate and distinct from every other cell. Communication there necessarily must be between the different cells, but it is by contact only, and not by continuity. Though the idea thus advanced was new and revolutionary, it was very soon generally accepted by histologists. Each single nerve cell came to be called a neuron—a nerve entity—

and the theory of the neurons has now become a dogma in minute brain anatomy.

Certain very interesting theoretic considerations have been drawn from the existence of neurons. It was extremely difficult, in fact practically impossible, to understand under the old association theory of an intimate persistent connection between all parts of the brain how that organ could be made to apply itself to one line of thought, to the exclusion of every other. A complicated mechanism controlling the blood supply of the brain, only permitting an absolutely free circulation in the parts to be used and allowing but a limited supply to the rest of the brain, was the best explanation that could be given. Needless to say, this was very unsatisfactory. In the light of the neuron theory the explanation becomes easy. The central nervous system becomes like the central office of a telephone company, the place where connections between the various terminal parts of a system are made. When nerve cells by means of the terminals of their axis cylinders are in contact, the nervous impulses in one flows over into the other. The end nerve fibrils have a function like that of the antennæ of ants. When they touch, the message is conveyed from one to the other. When there is no contact, no nervous impulses pass. Sleep is, as it were, the breaking of all the contacts except those necessary to carry on life—the closing of the exchange, in a word, though the batteries are left in circuit. When the cells contract and retract from weariness, first slowness of function results and then finally cessation of function. When by a sudden severe blow cells suffer from shock, they contract, and unconsciousness results. When the blow is very severe, not only the cells that are used for mental activity may be affected, but even the neurons more especially concerned with vital functions. If these are caused to retract, death ensues. Death from concussion or shock, where the most careful investigation reveals no direct injury to the nervous system, is a well known and not very rare event. Fright or sudden great emotion may kill in this way.

The essential disconnection of nerve cells serves to hint at least how in the present order of things trains of thought are isolated from each other. The brain is always used as an organ, but only those parts are "connected up," as the electricians say, which are wanted for the transmission of the ideas that occupy the mind at a given moment. Every one is familiar with the feeling that the mind is sometimes groping, as it were, for a word or an idea. It is on "the tip of the tongue," the mind seems just on the point of grasping it, yet it fails to come when wanted. Later it bobs up serenely of itself.

The nerve filaments failed to make the proper connections for the reproduction of the word or idea for the moment, but later, impressed by the unsuccessful effort made, they take, as it were, the first free opportunity they have to make spontaneously the connections so persistently but vainly sought for before.

All this, of course, is theory. No one has even seen a neuron move in the higher animals, though they have been seen to contract in some of the very low animals. The theory has, however, a good anatomical basis, and it undoubtedly constitutes the most interesting contribution to physiological psychology that brain histology has made.

The neuron theory is interesting from another standpoint. Under the older theories that made nerve fibres in the brain of great importance and endeavored to explain consciousness and certain relational mental activities on the ground of association, that is, the interaction of cells and the power of nervous reflexes to awaken nervous energy and excite brain function, the necessity for the vital activity behind the mechanism was apt to be more or less lost sight of. With the neuron theory, unless one were to predicate of each brain cell an individual consciousness and purpose that would make of each of them a distinct intellectual being, we are brought face to face with the necessity for a guiding force, a *spiritus rector*, behind the cells, which energises and coördinates them.

We are brought, then, in the light of the most recent advances in physiological psychology to a position not unlike that which biologists have been forced to take up of late years. In biology, mechanical, chemical and physical theories of function held their sway for a good many years. They have all given way, however, to the realization that the cell is the important element in physiological function, and that behind the cell there is a force whose energies are not according to ordinary physical and chemical laws, but represent something entirely distinct from matter. Long ago Huxley said: "The cells are no more the producers of the vital phenomena than the shells scattered on the seashore are the instruments by which the gravitation force of the moon acts upon the ocean. Like these, they only mark where the vital tide has been and how it has acted." "There is more in life than the processes it controls," Gowers, the distinguished English nervous specialist, said. Nowhere in the body is the ancillary character of the cells more manifest than in the brain.

It has, too, been growing more evident of late that perhaps too much importance has been attached to the brain as the exclusive

seat of the processes by which sensations are differentiated and intellection accomplished. Even in the brain itself it has been pointed out that the part in which the most complicated mechanism of cells and fibres exists is the cerebellum, not the cerebrum, though it is clear that the cerebellum is associated with functions of lesser dignity than those which are accomplished in the cerebrum. Memory more than any other faculty associated with intellection has seemed to have a definite location in the brain tissues. The obliteration of part of the cerebral function often takes with it a part of the stored up knowledge of the individual. It has been noted more than once that a hemorrhage into the brain would cause the complete disappearance of the power to use a language learned late in life, while leaving absolutely intact another acquired years before. With regard to memory, however, it may be pointed out that every cell in the body seems to possess something of the faculty. The practical value of training depends on this fact. In the modern studies of disease and immunity there are a number of interesting observations that point to the conclusion that certain impressions made even on ordinary body cells are never eradicated.

The neurons of the brain, that is, the cells within the skull and their branches, are very little differentiated one from another. Those that preside over hearing are not recognizably distinct from those that rule over sight or smell. It is doubtful if even certain distinctions that were supposed to obtain among cells devoted to functions even farther apart from each other than are the special senses have any existence in the living cells. Very recently Nissl's staining methods have given some most suggestive pictures of the interior of nerve cells and have aroused the hope that our pathology of mental diseases was to have its development in the observation of changes within the brain cells. So far the hope has not been fulfilled, and not the slightest hint has been obtained of any difference of internal arrangement within the cell to correspond to any difference of function that it may subtend. The nerve endings for the special senses, the rods and cones in the eye, the touch corpuscles in the skin, the olfactory fibres in the nose, the muscle plates in the skeletal muscles, are all highly specialized. It is at the periphery of the nervous system, very probably, not at the centre, that the modifications of sensation are accomplished which cause the translation of sensory stimuli into various terms when they reach the consciousness.

Physiological psychology is as yet groping in the dark with regard to the physical basis that subtends sensation and intellection.

There was much more confident assertion of knowledge ten years ago than there is now. The realization of the utter incompleteness of certain notions that were generally accepted in the first enthusiastic reception of observations that seemed to be of wider significance than they eventually proved to be has had a chastening influence. Exaggerated claims for physiological psychology and the hopes the new science holds out of elucidating the problems of psychology are growing ever rarer and rarer. Professor Hugo Münsterberg, of Harvard, said in a recent essay[2] on physiology and psychology: "The hope that physiological psychology will give us a fuller acquaintance with the psychological facts as such is, therefore, an illusion."

While we may look, then, for great practical benefits from physiological psychology because of its relations to mental diseases, there is no ground for the fear that the science may prove materialistic in its development. Certainly all its tendencies at present are towards a recognition of the mystery that lies behind cell energy in the accomplishment of intellectual acts, while its present position emphasizes the truth that mental processes, though dependent on matter, are evidently beyond the sphere of the material and belong to a totally different order of things.

JAMES J. WALSH.

New York.

A CENTURY OF IRISH IMMIGRATION.

DURING the present century four and a half million people of Irish birth emigrated to the United States, and at the close of the century there are more than five million Americans of Irish parentage—a number greater than the whole white population of the United States at the beginning of the century.

The close of the century, too, finds more people of Irish parentage in the United States than in Ireland. Ireland has sent more colonists to North America during the nineteenth century than all Europe sent in three hundred years. As compared in numbers, all the previous great migrations of history dwindle into insignificance when placed side by side with the Irish migration. The successive migrations which overturned the Roman Empire did not aggregate within a million of nineteenth century Irish immigration.

[2] "Psychology and Life." 1899. Houghton, Mifflin & Co.

Less than a million people followed Alaric and Attila; the Vandal migration which overspread Spain and Northern Africa is never estimated at more than a million. The great tribal movement of the Tartars under Genghis Kahn numbered but 800,000. The Huguenot migration from France, in the eighteenth century, did not exceed a quarter of a million; yet, singular to say, the historians have paid more attention to it than they have to the great Celtic trans-Atlantic migration of the nineteenth century.

From 1840 to 1860 two million Irish immigrants settled in the United States; from 1860 to 1880, one million; and another million from 1880 to the present time. The tide of immigration, which was accelerated by the famine of 1847 to "a million a decade," has averaged a little over half a million a decade since 1860.

Had Irish migration been directed to the virgin forests of the Northwest, it might have founded here a dozen great Irish-American States of the Union. Economic conditions and divers other causes decreed that it should end its journey among the New England and Middle States. Here, at the close of the century, reside three-fifths of the Irish immigrants and their descendants. Something over a fourth of this immigration found its way to the twelve agricultural States called the North Central States: Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, Illinois, Wisconsin, Missouri, Iowa, Minnesota, Kansas, Nebraska and North and South Dakota.

This circumstance of territorial distribution has decidedly influenced the occupation and social condition of the Irish immigrants. The people of the North Atlantic States are more of an urban than an agricultural people, but one-fifth of their number living on farms. On the other hand, nearly half of the people of the twelve North Central States (the "West" of other days) are farmers.

But as the Irish immigrants are most largely settled in the non-agricultural States, it happens that they are to-day less of an agricultural people than any other considerable element of our population, but fifteen per cent. of their whole number residing on the farms of the country.

In the twelve North Central States above mentioned nearly a third of the Irish-born people are engaged in agriculture, a percentage not greatly below that of their neighbors of other racial extractions. In Iowa, for instance, according to the census of 1890, there were over fifty thousand people of Irish maternity pursuing gainful occupations, twenty-five thousand of whom were engaged in agriculture. In the Dakotas, of fourteen thousand persons of Irish maternity pursuing gainful occupations, nearly 8,000 were farmers. In Wisconsin, of fifty thousand persons of Irish

maternity pursuing gainful occupations, twenty-two thousand were engaged in farming; these statistics going to show that occupation is largely determined by the matter of a people's territorial distribution.

Among the many important effects of Irish immigration on American history was its decisive influence in destroying the sectional equilibrium between the North and the South, which, since the foundation of the Government, had been the recurring issue in American politics. Irish immigration swelled the numerical preponderance of the North and set in motion Western migration of Northern people, thus building up the great Northwestern States, which gave the non-slave-holding Commonwealths a majority in Congress. "We should have excluded the Irish when we shut out the Negro," said a Southern politician before the war; and the Know-Nothing programme won in the South particularly because of this view.

SOCIAL CONDITION OF THE IRISH-BORN POPULATION.

Since the United States census of 1870 more attention has been paid to gathering statistics regarding our foreign-born population than in previous enumerations. We are enabled from the census reports of 1870, 1880 and 1890 to obtain some interesting facts with regard to the social condition of the Irish-born citizens of the United States.

Although the great tide of Irish immigration ended about the year 1863, the Irish-born population of the United States has remained almost the same from 1860 to 1890. The United States census shows that in 1870 there were 1,856,000 Irish-born people in the United States, in 1880 there were 1,855,000 Irish-born people in the United States and in 1890 there were 1,871,000 Irish-born people in the United States.

In 1880 residents of the United States of Irish parentage numbered 4,530,000 and in 1890 4,913,000. No statistics of this nature were gathered by the census of 1870.

Occupation is an index of social condition. As to the Irish-born residents of the United States, the census reports yield these significant facts:

	Census 1870.	Census 1880.	Census 1890.
Irish-born farmers.....	88,000	107,000	100,000
Irish-born laborers.....	229,000	225,000	203,000

Of the whole population of this country pursuing gainful occupations 24 per cent. are farmers; of the German-born population

nearly 20 per cent. are farmers; of the Irish-born population nearly 10 per cent. are farmers.

The figures above given indicate that if our Irish-born population is still chary toward its better destiny on the farms of the country, it is, nevertheless, also emerging from the status of a laboring population.

The total number of Irish-born persons pursuing gainful occupations was in 1880, 979,000, and in 1890, 1,065,000. In 1880 23 per cent. of the Irish population were laborers. In 1890 the percentage of Irish-born laborers is 19 per cent.

While the number of unskilled Irish-born laborers shows some decrease, there is some gain in Irish-born skilled labor, as the following figures respecting the chief trades will indicate:

	1880.	1890.
Irish-born blacksmiths	13,000	13,490
Irish-born carpenters	14,000	16,126
Irish-born masons	13,000	14,540
Irish-born machinists	6,000	8,200

Fifteen per cent. of the people of the United States are engaged in trade and transportation, or what is ordinarily called mercantile pursuits. Only 9 per cent. of the Irish-born population are thus engaged, according to the census of 1890. They have, however, made a slight gain in this respect as compared with the census of 1880.

In the professions Irish-born people are also making progress:

	1880.	1890.
Irish-born clergymen in the United States	2,516	2,817
Irish-born lawyers in the United States	1,008	1,248
Irish-born teachers in the United States	3,916	3,937
Irish-born physicians in the United States	1,028	1,065
Irish-born journalists in the United States	324	462

Here are some facts for the votary of temperance, indicating that not only the Irish, but also the Germans are leaving the liquor business:

	1880.	1890.
Irish-born saloon-keepers	8,500	7,500
German-born saloon-keepers	21,000	19,200

A prejudice which regards the policemen as too numerously of Irish birth may be corrected by these figures:

	1890.
Total policemen	74,629
Irish-born policemen	12,500
German-born policemen	5,800

The census of 1890 shows that there are 1,216,000 female domestic servants in the United States, of whom 154,553 are Irish-born and 133,500 of German and Scandinavian birth. Two-thirds of our female domestic servants are of native birth.

THE SECOND GENERATION.

Our studies in the last census reports (of 1890) give us very hopeful indications respecting the social condition of the second generation of the Irish race in America. Taking occupation as an index of social condition, we note that in the United States (according to the census of 1890) there were engaged in gainful occupations a total of 1,065,000 persons of Irish birth and 1,122,000 persons of native birth, but of Irish maternity. Now the question as to whether the second generation of the Irish race is improving in social condition compared to its parent stock will be answered by noting how these two armies of workers are distributed in the occupations.

It appears that while there are 203,000 laborers in the United States of Irish birth, there are less than 90,000 laborers of native birth and Irish maternity. In other words, while one out of five of the Irish-born people in the United States belong to the ranks of unskilled labor, but one out of twelve of the second generation is thus classed. There are 154,000 Irish-born female servants in the United States, or one out of seven of the working Irish-born population here; but there are only 68,315 domestic servants among the second generation, or one out of 16 of that generation.

The second generation is not taking to the farms, however. While there are 100,000 Irish-born farmers in the United States, but 77,000 native persons of Irish maternity are so classed. The obvious drift of the second generation of all classes is away from the farms.

In "trade and transportation," which includes all mercantile pursuits, 162,000 Irish-born persons are engaged, and 245,000 persons of native birth, but Irish maternity. This indicates the drift of the Irish race in America from the ranks of unskilled labor to the higher avocations of trade and commerce.

In the department of skilled labor progress is also apparent:

	Irish Born.	Native born of Irish Maternity.
Carpenters	16,100	17,500
Shoemakers	14,500	23,000
Machinists	8,200	15,000
Blacksmiths	13,500	11,300
Dressmakers	12,230	43,500
Plumbers	4,224	13,300

It is in the professions, however, that we note the strongest evidence of the social amelioration of the Irish-American:

	Irish Born.	Native born of Irish Maternity.
Clergymen	2,817	2,342
Lawyers	1,243	3,390
Physicians	1,063	2,125
Journalists	462	1,000
Teachers	3,937	24,900
Engineers	1,114	2,085
Theatrical	700	2,375
Government officials	750	5,448
Artists and authors	350	986

The second generation is not filling the ranks of the priesthood as readily as the parent stock; but their great increase in all the professions, and especially in the desks of authority in the schools, is noteworthy.

For purposes of comparison these figures will be of interest:

PERCENTAGE OF CLASSES OF POPULATION ENGAGED IN CERTAIN OCCUPATIONS.

	Of the whole Population.	Of the Irish born.	Of Native born with Irish Mothers.
Lawyers	.39	.11	.29
Teachers	1.50	.37	2.29
Officials	.35	.34	.52
Policemen	.34	1.15	.68

The following statistics will also be of interest:

	Irish Born.	Native born of Irish Maternity.
Saloon-keepers	7,575	5,600
Policemen	12,500	7,600

Thus, there are more lawyers, doctors and authors among the second generation of Irish-Americans than there are saloon-keepers, and more teachers than policemen.

IRISH AND GERMAN IMMIGRATION COMPARED.

Ireland and Germany, having furnished the two main streams of immigration to the United States, comparisons will naturally be of interest. The climax of Irish immigration was reached in the decade 1850-60; the climax of German immigration in the decade

1880-90. In the latter decade German immigration outnumbered Irish immigration by over 800,000, and solidly established the Germans in the first rank as the most considerable "foreign" element in our population.

The statistics of Irish and German immigration by decades are here given:

	From Ireland.	From Germany.	From Great Britain "Not specified" (Mostly Irish)
1820-31	50.754	6,751	7,942
1831-40	207,381	152,454	65,347
1841-50	780,719	434,626	229,979
1851-60	914,119	951,657	132,199
1861-70	456,593	822,007	349,656
1871-80	444,588	757,698	7,908
1881-90	655,482	1,452,970	....
1891-99 (June 30)	366,767	529,666	....
	3,876,444	5,107,829	793,031

The total Irish immigration to the United States from 1820-99 is set down in books of statistics at 3,876,444. But Carroll D. Wright in "The Statesman's Year Book" (1899) says: "Many persons immigrated from Ireland are brought under Great Britain, not specified, or the British provinces." From Great Britain, "not specified," the total immigration (1820-98) was 793,000, and from the British provinces, 1,048,000. It is a very moderate estimate to figure half a million Irish among these, especially as most of those classed as "Great Britain, not specified," immigrated soon after the Irish famine of 1847.

The census returns for the last forty years with reference to the Irish and German elements in the population are of interest:

	1850.	1860.	1870.
Irish-born	961,719	1,611,304	1,855,827
German-born	583,774	1,276,075	1,690,563
		1880.	1890.
Irish-born		1,854,571	1,871,509
German-born		1,966,742	2,784,849
Irish parentage		4,529,523	4,913,238
German parentage		4,883,842	6,871,524

In 1850 the Irish were two-fifths of all the foreign-born; in 1890 they were one-fifth. In 1850 the Germans were one-fourth of the foreign-born population; they are now three-tenths. No compilations of foreign parentage by separate countries were made until the census of 1880.

In 1870 there were 165,000 more Irish-born people in the United States than people of German birth; but in 1880 the German-born population exceeded the Irish-born population by 112,000. This gain of 377,000 was principally due to the fact that German immigration during the decade 1870-80 exceeded Irish immigration by 313,000. Again, in 1890 the German-born population shows a further gain over the Irish-born population of some 800,000, due to the fact that German immigration during the decade ending 1890 exceeded Irish immigration by 787,000.

The American-born children of the Irish immigrants numbered in 1890 somewhat over three millions, and the American-born children of German immigrants somewhat over four million. The fact that Irish immigration is older than German immigration may justify us in estimating that the Irish element (counting the third and fourth generations) is not, however, much behind, numerically, the German element.

German immigration, coming later than Irish immigration, peopled the West, so that to-day one-fifth of the German-Americans are farmers. In the North Central States there are 816,000 German-born persons pursuing gainful occupations to 238,000 Irish-born persons (census of 1890).

It is apparently a mistake, however, to assume that the Irish are by any large disproportion a city element in this country. To reside in the cities is more or less the fate of all immigrations. Taking the census returns of 1890 for the thirty large cities of the United States, we find the German-born population exceeds the Irish-born population in twenty-three cities, including New York, Chicago, Brooklyn and St. Louis.

Of the Irish-born population in 1890 56 per cent. was found in the 124 principal American cities; 48 per cent. of the German-born population was also found in these cities. Of the whole number of Russians, Poles and Italians 57, 58 and 59 per cent., respectively, were found in the principal cities—these three foreign elements being more inclined even than the Irish to crowd in the cities.

The number of persons of Irish maternity pursuing gainful occupations is only a few thousand larger than the number of persons of German maternity pursuing gainful occupations. How the second generation of these great elements is distributed in occupation will be of interest:

	Natives of German Maternity.	Natives of Irish Maternity
Farmers	148,000	77,000
Servants (female)	73,371	68,315

	Natives of German Maternity.	Natives of Irish Maternity.
Saloon-keepers	6,978	5,585
Clergymen	1,974	2,350
Lawyers	2,177	3,390
Teachers	10,052	24,900
Officials	2,827	5,448
Policemen	3,193	7,621
Laborers	63,400	90,400
Trade and transportation	221,000	245,000

The Irish element is far behind the German element in agriculture, but far ahead in the professions and slightly ahead in the pursuits classed as mercantile.

SOME VITAL STATISTICS.

According to the statistics gathered by the United States census of 1890, the death rate in the United States is about 18 to 1,000 inhabitants (Part II., Miscellaneous Statistics, p. 3). The rural districts are healthier, of course, than the cities, the actual death rate in the country being estimated at probably 15.5 per 1,000; in the cities, 23.5

The birth rate in the cities, according to the census of 1890 (Part II., Vital Statistics), is 27 per 1,000 of the population. So it happens that the modern city grows naturally in population. This was not the case with cities in former centuries. Their death rate exceeded their birth rate; they would have shrunk in population except for the reinforcements they received from the rural districts.

The birth rate in New York city is 28⅜ per 1,000 inhabitants; in Chicago, 31; in Milwaukee, 33⅛; in St. Paul, 31½—these being cities where the foreign-born population is largest (38 to 42 per cent. of the whole). In Baltimore the birth rate is 25½; in Indianapolis, 20⅜; in Washington, 21—these being cities where the foreign-born population is smallest.

During the census year 1890 9,569 children were born in the city of New York of native parentage and 26,845 of foreign-born parentage. In other words, 27 per cent. of the births were of native parents and 73 per cent. of foreign parents. The foreign population of New York in 1890 was 42 per cent. of the total population. The birth rate to foreign-born parents was 42½ per 1,000 of foreign-born persons. The birth rate to native parents was 11 per 1,000 of native-born persons.

The excess of births among the foreign-born population is to be attributed to the fact that they are more largely an adult population and probably more fecund. In Boston, where the foreign-born population was 35 per cent. of the total population, the births of native maternity number 2,408, and of foreign 6,098 (8 to 1,000 of the native-born population; 39 to 1,000 of the foreign-born population). Here we observe that the foreign-born population, numbering a little more than one-third of the whole population, had more than twice as many births as the native population. In Cincinnati the births of native maternity were 3,420; of foreign maternity, 3,083. The foreign-born population of Cincinnati in 1890 was 24 per cent. of the entire population.

The death rate in our cities averages 22.78 per 1,000 whites. (In London the death rate is 20.3 per cent.; in Paris, 24½; in Dublin, 26½.) The element of Irish maternity, which is largely a city element in this country, averages a death rate of 26.74. Those of German maternity average a death rate of 19.87. In New York city the death rate among those of Irish maternity is 32.2. Among those of German maternity it is 22. As indicating that this large death rate is chiefly due to the crowding of people in the tenement quarters, we may note the contrast presented in such cities as Milwaukee, Detroit and Cincinnati. In Detroit the death rate among those of Irish maternity is 18 per 1,000; in Milwaukee, 17.45 per 1,000; in Cincinnati, 15.77 per 1,000. The death rate of those of German maternity in the two latter cities is slightly greater than the death rate among those of Irish maternity.

These conclusions, applicable to the Irish element, are derivable from the foregoing statistics:

I. Had the Irish immigration been settled on the farms of the country rather than in the cities, its numerical strength in the several census enumerations would be greater.

II. It has been distanced numerically by the German element (1) because German immigration was larger; (2) because the conditions for natural increase are better among the Germans—they being more largely settled on the farms.

III. Compared with the native population, in the Eastern States especially, the Irish element (in common with other immigrant elements), is increasing and will increase relatively much more rapidly. In many New England cities, and in three of the New England States, the Irish element will ultimately constitute an actual majority of the population. This would also be the case with New York and Chicago, except for the larger German element which keeps pace with or passes the Irish element in natural increase.

BOOKS RELATING TO THE AMERICAN IRISH.

About the year 1850, when fully a million Irish-born people were settled in the United States, the Irish-American community became sufficiently self-conscious to wish a survey of its status and its prospects. In that year Thomas D'Arcy McGee, then editor of the *Boston Pilot*, and a man of fine literary accomplishments and patriotic sympathies, published a book entitled "A History of the Irish Settlers in North America." Its chapters called attention to the large Irish emigration here during the eighteenth century and the part the Irish race bore in the American Revolution.

McGee also discussed the position and requirements in 1850 of the Irish in America. Out of a population of twenty-four millions, he estimated the Irish-American element at four millions. The census of 1850, however, shows an Irish-born population of a little over 900,000. McGee was plainly of opinion that the future of the Irish lay in newer States. "The torrent of emigration from Ireland," he said, "must in a few years abate its force. Whatever we can do for ourselves as a people must be done before the close of this century; or the epitaph of our race will be written in the West with the single sentence *Too Late*."

It was in furtherance of this view that McGee coöperated in calling an Irish-American convention at Buffalo to promote Western emigration. Bishop Hughes, of New York, opposed the plan. Even without the Bishop's opposition conditions were adverse.

At the time of the great influx from Ireland (1850-8) there was an abnormal development of American industries in the East. The Irish immigrant was attracted and held in the bondage of these industries. The natural stream Westward to Government lands was stayed, and the future of Irish-America thereby markedly modified. Instead of an agricultural and farming people, the Irish immigrants became hewers of wood and drawers of water to Eastern capitalists in Eastern mines and mills.

In the year following the close of the Civil War, John Francis Maguire visited the United States, and, as a result of what was evidently a very careful survey of the field, gave to the public his book entitled "The Irish in America." Mr. Maguire was proprietor of the *Cork Examiner*, a leading Nationalist daily of Ireland. He had been for many years a member of Parliament, representing, as an advocate of tenant right, an Irish and Catholic constituency. His study of the Irish in America is by all odds the best record extant of nineteenth century Irish emigration. It is apparent that his point of view emphasizes the moral and religious side of the subject—the his-

tory of Irish emigration seeming, in the pages of his work, to be a record of the growth of the Catholic Church in the United States. In common with McGee and all subsequent writers who have dwelt upon the condition of the Irish in America, he notes their great numbers in the cities and the small percentage on the farms. And he concurs in the view that the race should be given such incentive and such direction as would promote its colonization in the agricultural districts of the West.

A work especially written with a view of promoting Irish colonization is Bishop Spalding's "Religious Mission of the Irish People," published about the year 1880. It expresses the plain consciousness of the race that the opportunities it had in the early tides of its immigration to found great Irish Commonwealths in the Northwest has been lost, and that the cities have been the cemetery of the race's energy. There is a chapter on the Irish-Catholic Colonization Society, an enterprise in which the Bishop was interested about the year 1880, together with Bishops Ireland and O'Connor and Mr. W. J. Onahan, and which, like its companion movement, the Irish-American Colonization Company, managed by John Sweetman, so slightly affected the great problem and so little recovered the lost opportunity. Bishop Spalding's thesis is that the Irish Catholics are the most important element of the Church in this country, but that their environment is a hindrance to their working out, in the fullest measure, their religious mission.

"The Irish Race, Past and Present," by Rev. August J. Thebaud, S. J., is a sympathetic and eulogistic study of the religious and moral strong points of the Irish as displayed in their history. It contains a few chapters bearing on the American Irish, written altogether with reference to the religious mission that Father Thebaud marks out for the race.

Following the great recrudescence in 1880 of Irish-American patriotism (which had suffered abatement in the dying out of Fenianism, only to revive with the agitation of the land question), Philip H. Bagenal, an Oxford man, published a book entitled "The American Irish." Mr. Bagenal, who writes from a Tory standpoint, but with some claim to the judicial quality, comes to the study of the question too much with reference to the movement of the day, to-wit, the Irish land question and the influence of the Irish-American element on American and British politics. While this must limit, to some extent, the value of his investigations, his work is interesting as exhibiting the awakening of the British conscience to the hereafter that its misrule of Ireland has prepared for it in this country. Mr. Bagenal is also impressed with the way the Irish race congest

American cities and their avoidance of what their best interests dictate—settlement on the farms. His study of Irish parties in America and the political and moral status of the Celtic race in this country is instructive reading, despite his tendency to arrive at alarming or despondent conclusions.

No survey of American history or politics since 1840 would be complete without some reference to Irish immigration and the influence of "The Irish Vote;" and we have a wide and varied mass of estimates on this subject, from the few but judicial references to the American Irish in Bryce's "American Commonwealths" to the uniformly disparaging and hostile views of Van Holst in his "Constitutional History of the United States" (a work said to have been subsidized by the Prussian Government).

Of course, we may read much bearing on the Irish-American community in the periodical literature of the last half century. A glance at Poole's Index will convince one of this. O. A. Brownson, a New Englander, who became a convert to the Catholic Church about the year 1845, published a *Quarterly Review*, and for nearly twenty years, dating '46 to '65, its pages contain frequent articles referring to the social and political status of Irish-Americans.

In the *North American Review* for January, 1841, we meet one of the first magazine articles which notes the growing problem of Irish immigration. Called forth by the Nativistic movement, it dwells largely on the question of naturalization. This and similar transient issues of the kind furnish the main points from which Irish immigration is discussed up to the period of the Civil War in numerous pamphlets and review articles. As for more recent magazine articles on the American Irish it is sufficient to mention Froude's two papers in the *North American Review* of December, 1879, and January, 1880; Bocock's "Irish Conquest of Our Cities," in the *Forum* (vol. xvii., p. 186); Merwin's discussion of "The Irish in American Life," in the *Atlantic* (vol. lxxvii., p. 28), and two notable articles in the English magazines—the *Westminster Quarterly Review* (vol. cxxxiii., p. 290) and the *Fortnightly Review* (vol ix., p. 220), the latter article by John Morley.

H. J. Desmond.

Milwaukee.

SIR THOMAS MORE AND THE PERSECUTION OF HERETICS.

AN HISTORICAL INQUIRY.

IT is a trite saying, the paternity of which might in all probability be traced to Machiavelli, that "a skilful advocate will never tell a lie, when suppressing the truth will answer his purpose; and if a lie must be told, he will rather, if he can, lie by insinuation than by direct assertion." It was no doubt this axiom, or one strongly analogous to it, that prompted Dean Swift to give us his deliciously quaint dissertation on *"lies,"* categorically classifying them as "additory, detractory and translatory," and which unlovely congeries his inimitable wit illumines in a manner at once droll, satiric and instructive. The latent energy and full development of this axiom, which in some of its diversified and variable forms is found in the proverbial philosophy of almost every civilized nation, probably finds no wider field or extensive application than in ecclesiastico-historical writing. Here it usually becomes obtrusively conspicuous and clamorously assertive, bringing its concentrated energies in full action when it deals with the Church of God. As long as these assaults on the Church find themselves voiced in the melodramatic vaporings and falsetto shrieks of a King, Thompson, Fulton or Hittel—with a sophomoric display of erudition and a kindergarten capacity of credulity that intuitively relegate their labors from the domain of critical analysis to that of psychiatric diagnosis, leaving only a vague and confused impression on what Carlyle misanthropically designates as the "inarticulate multitude" —the "multitude" which Sir Thomas Browne, with an acrimony not wholly destitute of truth, calls "the great enemy of reason, virtue and religion"—they will usually be found abortive, reactionary and always in the end—self-defeating. When, however, they present themselves under the sponsorship of accredited, even thought-moulding literary media, the vehicle itself giving a prestige which the author could not otherwise command, then critical interest for the moment becomes aroused, and the vindication of truth becomes a solemn obligation, a sacred duty. These reflections suggest themselves in reading a recent article in one of our most conservative American reviews,[1] where a tabulated and chronological catalogue of hoary, obsolete

[1] "The Rebellion Against the Royal Supremacy," *North American Review*, November, 1899.

and exploded charges are made against the Church, while ostensibly unraveling the tangled skein of Ritualism. The article is noteworthy for several characteristics usually inseverable from conventional Protestant polemics. There is an absence of all studied rudeness and offensive arrogance, of ludicrous conceits and coarse invective—but all the same there is found a naïve ingenuousness and insidious dogmatism, which

> . . . under fair pretence of friendly ends,
> Baited with reasons not unplausible,
> Wind them into the easy-hearted man,
> And hug them into snares.

In honest polemics it is always more chivalrous to face an opponent with lowered visor in open field, than introduce the enemy into the citadel by the strategic wooden horse. To attempt a refutation of charges that sound scholarship has long since remanded to professional purveyors of anti-Catholic pabulum, the commercial value of whose merchandise is daily depreciating and becoming more unmarketable, would be about as heroic as Sir John Falstaff hacking the corpse of the dead Percy.

Among the charges which press the axiom above alluded to, to its full extent, we find a calumny affecting the name of one of the most eminent statesmen and intrepid patriots of English history: a man whose profound learning was the admiration of world-wide scholarship; whose moral splendor was the eulogy and envy of European courts; whose præeminent sanctity, before ecclesiastical beatification took the initiative, by public acclaim, blazoned the halo of sainthood on his brow; one whose inhuman execution sent a thrill of horror and consternation over the civilized world; one whose martyrdom was a fitting crown to a life consecrated to duty and justice, humanity and God. We refer to Sir Thomas More.

"Sir Thomas More," says the writer of the article in question, the Earl of Portsmouth, and it may parenthetically be stated, with apodictic lordliness, citing no authority, "Sir Thomas More, whose noble death has obliterated, if it has not largely condoned, the recollection of his acts, was especially active in this direction [suppression of heretics] . . . Men and women were taken and tried in Sir Thomas More's house at Chelsea and burned for their principles. . . . James Bainham, a gentleman of the Temple . . . [was] brought before More, who had him whipped in his presence and then taken to the Tower and racked before his eyes."[2]

Was Sir Thomas More a religious persecutor? Were men and women tried in his house and burned for their principles? Was James Bainham racked before his eyes in the Tower?

[2] *North American Review*, ut. sup., 724-725.

It is a strange and rather bewildering fact that in the light of modern historical research: the buried treasures of unpublished and unedited documents sifted and analyzed by such unimpeachable writers as Brewer, Gardiner, Freeman, Gasquet: the cumulative evidence of these researches exposing a conspiracy of falsehood formidable enough to shake one's confidence in the integrity of the whole body of historical writing: this evidence at the same time reversing the original verdict of history, and the ripened judgment and clearer vision of mankind acclaiming that reversal a providential triumph of truth and justice, the scathing indictment, attainting Sir Thomas More a bloodthirsty persecutor should again make its appearance. It has been said, with no little truth, that the posthumous vicissitudes of great men are not only of absorbing interest, but permanently fix their status in history; again, as if contradicting this very maxim—that the resuscitation of a character which the Muse of History, after trial, has sentenced to death was a task, humanly speaking, impossible. In the case of Sir Thomas More we have an instance of an historic figure, buried like another Pompeii or Herculaneum under a veritable volcanic scoria of falsehood and slander, after centuries of shame and obloquy—rising Lazarus-like from its grave at the commanding voice of posthumous history. It was the modern historian whose largeness of vision would not be distorted by political bias, obscured by sectarian rancor, daunted by human fear, who toiled and delved until he exhumed the great Chancellor in his superb proportions. Instead of discovering a deformed pigmy, he found a colossal giant. A summons issued, not like that of Henry VIII. to the enshrined bones of More's illustrious predecessor in name, office, martyrdom and sainthood, Thomas a'Becket, to undergo the mockery of a ghoulish post-mortem trial, but in this instance to announce his honorable acquittal of all the odious charges brought against him, fixed his place on the bead-roll of England's worthies. The Muse of History, discovering the imposture which made her the vehicle of the evidence of a perjured judiciary, suborned witnesses and slanderous malignants, was perhaps somewhat tardy, but all the same unswerving in her sacred mission, and with fearless deliberation expunged the record of her momentary weakness and unconscious deception by penning with consistent emphasis and irreversible finality the decree that the superstitious devotee was, after all, a fervid Christian of the sanest piety, the bloody persecutor a public functionary of the most humane impulses, the beheaded felon one of the loftiest types of moral grandeur in the annals of our race. From that mo-

ment, like Socrates, with whom More had more points of resemblance than the mere identity of martyrdom, his life, virtues and fate became the glorious inheritance of mankind.

It must be owned that among More's contemporaries there were isolated and feeble appreciations, not to allude to the Catholic tradition that revered him as "England's honor, Faith's zealous champion and Christ's constant martyr," which clearly indicated that, left to its better instincts, mankind unerringly detects true merit. But it did not tend to one's peace of mind, protection of property or security of life during the reigns of "Henry the murderer of his wives, . . . Somerset the murderer of his brother . . . and Elizabeth the murderer of her guest,"[3] to be effusive or demonstrative in admiration of persons or policies that did not receive the government's sanction or the royal favor. Roger Ascham, the teacher of Elizabeth and Lady Jane Grey, tells us that the Chancellor was "a man whose virtues go to raise England above all nations,"[4] but with a prudence born of danger, confined his admiration to the reign of Queen Mary. We know that Cochlæus voiced the sentiment of the "new learning" when he eulogizes his hero as "a man whom all praised, loved, admired for his culture, his manners, his affability, courtesy, eloquence, prudence and innocence, who, moreover, as Lord High Chancellor, as the friend of the King, served the commonwealth with distinction from his youth, who as royal ambassador acquitted himself brilliantly of all his duties, and on the threshold of old age, in his gray hairs, stood an object of universal veneration,"[5] but his eulogy did not find utterance in ear-shot of London Tower. The cry of sorrow and execration, "*Interfecistis, interfecistis hominem omnium Anglorum optimum,*" uttered with bated breath and choked voice, hardly reached the royal ears, with the epithalamic ballads, ditties, balls, mummeries, jouets anent his recent nuptials, drowning aught else. Erasmus, the devoted friend and admirer of his companion in letters, had committed himself to warm and eloquent tributes, so much so that he, who disowned the intrepidity which canonized martyrs, found a happier and more assured asylum far from the land that endeared itself to him by ties of happy recollections and affectionate friendships.

Thomas More was born in 1480, four years before Luther; he was martyred in 1535, when the Reformation proudly rode the topmost crest of its dark, swollen waters, formless and inconstant as the

[3] Macaulay's Essays, Vol. I., p. 199. [4] " . . . *quo viro uno universa Anglia exteris gentibus nobilior est habita.*" Letter 156 Works of Roger Ascham, Vol. I., Part II., p. 118. London, 1865. [5] Stapleton, *Vita Thomae Mori*, c. xxxi. 1869.

waves that surged about it. Upon the fall of Cardinal Wolsey, he was selected as Lord Chancellor, assuming office in 1529, being then in his forty-ninth year. He was presumably the first layman, and admittedly the greatest lay or clerical incumbent who ever occupied the office. The comparative estimates sometimes instituted between More and Bacon, his only formidable rival, will hardly detract from the glory of the former, but in a crucial scrutiny dim the lustre of the latter. Both were men of eminent genius. With the tread and confidence of master minds both made successful, brilliant incursions into the fields of history, philosophy, theology and jurisprudence. If we balance them in their judicial characters, which falls in our present purview, we discover that Bacon may exhibit a more perfect mastery of technical detail, a greater knowledge of precedent, a more thorough grasp of the abstract principles of English law, a more masterful familiarity with

> . . . the lawless science of our laws,
> The codeless myriad of precedent,
> The wilderness of single instances;

but these qualifications, rare as they are, were more than outweighed by More's innate juridical poise of mind, intuitive perception of the most complex legal difficulties and an illuminant clearness of decision which, if it did not always carry conviction, invariably commanded respect, even in the face of the most vehement dissent. When it comes to moral attributes the comparison becomes a glaring contrast. Not a remote insinuation of scandal ever affected the stainless integrity of More, not a mote of suspicion ever flitted over his untarnished ermine, while obsequious servility, unpardonable ingratitude, criminal malversation in office, left blotches on "the greatest, wisest and meanest of mankind" that three centuries of persistent and aggressive apologetics have not explained away, much less effaced.

If his appointment was received with popular approbation in England, where his conspicuous ability, blameless life and earnest piety was the theme of national praise, it was hailed by a perfect chorus of classic latinity and exuberant enthusiasm in Continental Europe, where his epigrammatic wit, profound scholarship and zealous advocacy of classical learning earned him the respect and applause of all cultivated minds. As Chancellor his irreproachable conduct and legal supremacy was only equaled by his methodical application and indefatigable capacity for arduous work. The legacy of accumulated work left by his predecessor was disposed of with astonishing rapidity, so that one day the docket being found empty,

a condition probably without precedent, some humorous punster celebrated the event in the clever epigram:

> When More some years had Chancellor been,
> No more suits did remain;
> The like shall never more be seen
> Till more there be again.

In entering upon his office as Lord Chancellor he "had to swear," to quote Seebohm, "by his oath of office, among other things, to carry out the laws against heresy. He became by virtue of this office the public prosecutor of heretics."[6]

The law against heresy as we find it in the English Statute Book[7] made it a capital felony. The origin and cause of this drastic legislation lies deeper than the superficial student of history supposes. It was enacted in 1401 against the Lollards and Wickliffites, who "had been," as Froude, with manifest reluctance and to the surprise of those who know his historical methods, owns, "political revolutionists as well as religious reformers, the revolt against the spiritual authority had encouraged and countenanced a revolt against the secular, and we cannot be surprised, therefore, that the institutions should have united to repress a danger which was formidable to both."[8] It is always well to bear in mind, especially in view of the fact that has been sedulously kept out of sight, that "when we speak of the Lollards as martyrs," to put it pithily in the words of Dean Hook, "we ought to regard them as a kind of political martyrs rather than religious; they made religion their plea in order to swell the numbers of the discontented, but their actions all tended to a revolution in the State as well as Church." Like the Reformation in the sixteenth century and the French Revolution in the eighteenth, which historical criticism pronounces cause and effect, for both had a common genesis, the Lollards "directed their first attacks upon the Church because the Church was a most vulnerable part of the constitution. But the civilians," and this almost gives the analogy the force of an identity, "the citizen people were quite as much alarmed at their proceedings as the ecclesiastical. Both Church and State regarded the principles of the Lollards as subversive of all order in things temporal as in things spiritual."[9] This view is further confirmed by another fact usually overlooked, and one which Canon Stubbs brings clearly to light—that an exhaustive research of the history of England during the Middle Ages can produce but three instances, up to the legislation against Lollardism, where heresy was punished.[10]

[6] "The Era of the Protestant Revolution," pp. 180-181. [7] 2. H. iv., c. 15. [8] "History of England," Vol. II., p. 33. [9] "Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury," Vol. III., p. 72. [10] Stubbs: "Constitutional History of England," Vol. III., p. 353.

It was the identification of false doctrine with civil disorder, the association of heresy with rebellion, that made them an alarming menace to the populace, a political treason to the State, an object of condemnation to the Church. By a simple and pardonably specious process of reasoning, one that seemed imperious to the lawgiver, reassuring to the patriot and endorsed by conservative sentiment in Catholic and Protestant countries, and one that still finds a strong constituency, orthodoxy was legally defined, to quote an eminent Protestant theologian, Hagenbach, as "an obligation which man owed to the State; heresy, on the contrary, was considered a political crime."[11] "It was argued, to quote another Protestant authority and press the analogy closer, "that if treason and disrespect to earthly powers incurred the severest penalties, much more ought there to be inflicted on the guilty parties who, by their maintenance of false doctrine, had both imperiled souls and done despite to the majesty of heaven. . . . All sects agreed in the duty of exterminating heretics and unbelievers by the sword."[12] "To the sixteenth century," is the observation of one who speaks with commanding authority, Professor Gairdner, "heresy was a very serious evil . . . it was not mere wrong opinion, it was arrogance tending to a breach of the peace. Coercion of some kind seemed to be fairly called for. . . . A heretic," he continues, with striking clearness, "it should be remembered, is not only one who holds wrong opinions, we all do that more or less in the course of our life; he is one who arrogantly asserts in the face of authority that he is right when he is not competent, either in learning or in judgment, to discuss the matter. Thought was as free in the Middle Ages as it is in the present day," a demonstrable fact which is daily receiving wider recognition with thinking men; "but," he goes on, "if a fresh thinker saw any new light upon old questions he was expected to dispute the point in the schools with competent theologians, and not pour a flood of sophistries into the minds of admiring congregations, while claiming absolute irresponsibility for the position he took up."[13] In short, to reject the State religion was like refusing the State currency and, borrowing an illustration from St. Thomas Aquinas, establishing a mint of one's own.

Religious persecution, call it a folly, a madness or a crime, was indigenous to every soil, Christian or Pagan, Catholic or Protestant, with the one cogent, palliative plea in favor of Catholicity, that its endeavor was to preserve the integrity of Christian Unity. The effort made to father the ill-favored offspring, with all its brood of

[11] "History of Doctrines," Vol. I., p. 244. [12] Chamber's "Book of Days," Vol. II., p. 504. [13] J. Gairdner in "Academy," 1891, pp. 491-492.

exaggerated monstrosities, on the Catholic Church has long since been abandoned to the recondite investigation of freshmen prize essayists, or the innocuous deliberations of the annual rustic Sabbath school convention. "Persecution among the early Protestants," writes Lecky, "was a distinct and definite doctrine, digested into elaborate treatises, indissolubly connected with a large portion of the received theology, developed by the most enlightened and farseeing theologians and enforced against the most inoffensive as against the most formidable sects. It was the doctrine of the palmiest days of Protestantism. It was taught by those who are justly esteemed its greatest leaders."[14] "Persecution," in the opinion of Hallam, "is the deadly original sin of the Reformed churches, that which cools every honest man's zeal for their cause, in proportion as his reading becomes more extensive."[15] The multiplication of sects and the dogmatism of private interpretation only aggravated matters, substituting for the one corporate authority, which was decried as the source of persecution, an infuriated host of ranting and canting sects, who in the same breath that they cursed the intolerance of Rome, inflicted the most pitiless punishment on each other. "Individuals," says Froude, "did not hesitate to ascribe to themselves the infallibility which they denied to the Church. Everybody was intolerant on principle, and was ready to cut the throat of an opponent whom his arguments failed to convince."[16] Probably the most truculent language on this subject we find, not in the imperial edicts of Trajan, Diocletian or Caracalla, but in the religiously preserved writings of the Saxon Reformer of Wittenberg. "If we punish thieves by the rope," fairly shouts Luther, "murderers by the sword, heretics by fire, why do we not attack with every weapon . . . the whole sink of Romish Sodoma . . . and wash our hands in its blood?"[17] The glosses usually adopted to explain away this savage ferocity have been abandoned by writers familiar with Luther and his language. The eminent Tübingen Professor of Theology Weizsäcker very judiciously contends that "it must not be overlooked that Luther in these fierce expressions, in the *Epit. Resp. Silv. Prier.*, and in his treatise against the Bull of Antichrist, represents his procedure against the hierarchy as a punishment for heresy, therefore a justifiable interference!"[18] A subject of uncommon interest to the psychologist would be the attempted solution, how far the mind that

[14] "History of Rationalism," Vol. II., p. 61. [15] "Constitutional History of England," Vol I., p. 154. N. Y., 1886. [16] "Short Studies on Great Subjects," Vol. I., p. 173. [17] Walch, "Luther's Werke," Vol. 20, p. 223; 2203-2207 et seq. [18] "Göttingen Gelehrten Anzeigen," p. 845. 1881.

gave utterance to such a doctrine would have allowed the will under advantageous conditions to put it in execution! Calvin, the Moses of the Reformed churches, the reign and dominion of the Genevan predestined saints firmly established, himself in the height of his unchallenged power, enforced his doctrines with an inflexible Mohammedan rigor. For the most trivial moral derelictions the most summary penalties were dealt out. "Between 1542 and 1546," says an authority of unimpeachable character in this specific case, "no fewer than fifty-eight persons were sentenced to death and seventy-six to exile. On the 6th of March, 1545, the gaoler reported to the Council that the prisons were full and could hold no more. . . . 'Human life,' says Professor Kampschulte, 'appeared to have lost its value in New Geneva.' "[19] Surely no Spanish Inquisitor, painted in all the revolting hues of traditional bloodthirstiness, could approximate the Mephistophelian ingenuity of the same spiritual autocrat, when in vindicating his conduct in the Servetus murder[20] he not only maintains that "heretics should be put to death without mercy," but intimates a doctrine by the closest inductive reasoning—one that stands unprecedented and unparalleled in the history of civilized or even uncivilized nations—that even "those who doubted this [inflicting the death penalty on heresy] should die for their doubts."[21]

Nor can we claim an amelioration, much less immunity from this spirit of persecution, in studying the growth of our Republic. During the entire colonial period "we were essentially a nation of Protestants . . . and took similar [European] methods in maintaining and perpetuating our Protestantism, excluding those who dissented from it from sharing in the government and frankly adopting the policy which had prevailed in England from the time of Queen Elizabeth."[22] We must hang our heads in shame and sorrow when we study the Pilgrim Fathers' theocracy, when "the cruelty of their laws against freedom of conscience," says Judge Black, "and the unfailing rigor with which they were executed made Massachusetts odious throughout the world."[23]

Another salient point, a contributing if not essential factor in studying the question, is the extreme severity of the law and contemptuous valuation placed on the sanctity of human life during the period of history under consideration. The law encompassed the cattle and game of the nobleman with the most rigid legislation,

[19] *Edinburgh Review*, January, 1870, p. 75. [20] *Fidelis expositio errorum M. Serveti et brevis eorundem refutatio ubi docetur jure gladii coercendos esse haereticos.* [21] Ib., p. 78. [22] Stillé: "Religious Tests in Pennsylvania," p. 10. [23] "Essays and Speeches of James Black," p. 193.

pitilessly enforced; it exposed human life to the most bloody penalties for the most petty transgressions. It is an axiom that no law was ever enacted without the object of its enforcement. Had all the laws of the English Statute Book, with capital punishment attached, been enforced according to their letter and intent, the population would have been decimated, the nation deluged in rivers of blood. According to Hollinshedd, 72,000 persons perished during the thirty-eight years' reign of Henry VIII. (1509-1547), mostly for being "rogues and beggars," in other words, their only crime was poverty. During the reign of Queen Elizabeth (1558-1603), extending over forty-five years, 16,000 were executed.[24] The golden days of Christian love and fraternal helpfulness,

> When good and bad were all unquestioned fed,
> When monks still practiced their dear Lord's command
> And rained their charity throughout the land,

were fast becoming nothing more than lingeringly sad memories of what was once "merrie old England." The suppression of the monasteries, sealing the beneficent channels of applied charity, threw the needy, homeless and helpless on the munificence of the government's bounty. To cope with the unexpected problem it in turn had recourse to a novel and effective altruism hitherto unknown in Christendom—one of the first and permanent fruits of the Reformation—by expunging poverty from the Christ-like virtues and placing it on the penal code, and by one blow extirpating poverty and its unfortunate victims. Even as late as the reign of George I. (1714-1727) the bloody code was still more amplified by enacting laws, inflicting the death penalty on all who were armed or disguised in any forest, park, highway, open heath, common or town; unlawful hunting, killing or stealing deer, robbing warrens, stealing or taking any fish out of any river, injuring Westminster Bridge or any other bridge.[25] The heresy act stood unrepealed in full force until 1677.

Such were the times, conditions and customs, contemporary motives, intentions and judgments under which More entered upon his official duties. Good sense and generous impulse would at once endeavor to wipe out the stigma cast on his name by establishing the valid claim that his violence in dealing with heretics was more an error attributable to his time than to his heart. But even this admission unduly and unjustly magnifies the rôle he played in suppressing heresy. The office involved upon him and his friends a nice and somewhat vexatious point of ethics, a perplexing tangle of casuistry. His theory of freedom of conscience was clearly for-

[24] *Edinburgh Review*, Vol. xix., p. 391. [25] 9 George I., c. 22; 12 George II., c. 29.

mulated in a work in the hands of every cultivated Englishman, read and quoted throughout the continent. His friendship with men like Erasmus and Colet no doubt only emphasized and intensified it. How could he then administer the office of an inquisitor of heretical pravity? But to bring the analogy to a closer range of vision. How can the judge, painfully cognizant of the disastrous evils of intemperance, grant a license to sell liquor? How can the judge whose conscience revolts against capital punishment inflict the death penalty? How can the judge whose soul shrinks from the sickening iniquity of the divorce procedure dissolve the bands of matrimony? Must individual predilection subordinate itself to official duty; harassing scruples yield to oath-bound obligations; subjective interpretation of the law surrender to the manifest intent of the law giver? "How was it possible for More the Statesman," asks a writer in the *Quarterly Review*, "to advocate toleration of sectaries, who sought violently to subvert the existing religion with which the civil order was so strictly united? Or for More the Magistrate to ignore the provisions of the laws he had sworn to administer for the maintenance of that religion?" He strengthens his position still further by quoting Jeremy Taylor's clinching argument that "the commonwealth is made a church; the law of the nation made a part of the religion; Christ is made King and the temporal power is His substitute. But if we say, like the people in the Gospel, '*Nolumus hunc regnare*,' then God has armed the temporal power with a sword to cut us off."[26]

More was an avowed advocate and fearless champion of freedom of conscience perilously in advance of his time, his path-breaking innovations, promulgating "advanced opinions," according to Hume, "which even at present would be deemed somewhat too free."[27] In his "Utopia," a work prototyped in Plato's "Republic," and which was not a mere philosophical romance, but contained a perfect storehouse of legislative wisdom and political maxims, he published to the world his real views, as Erasmus tells us, "to show how commonwealths might be better managed," and above all, that "he had England, which he knows thoroughly, principally in view." The mere publication of this work was an act of daring hardihood. "Only a thinker who placed conviction above even life," says a writer whose admirable study of More is unfortunately somewhat distorted, "would have dared put forth a work so bold and so well calculated to open the eyes of the people to the shallow pretense as well as criminality of the rich and powerful."[28] And in it we find

[26] *Quarterly Review*, October, 1896. pp. 361-362. [27] "History of England," Vol. III., p. 122 Philadelphia, 1796. [28] Arena, vol. 15, p. 118.

such a vehement advocacy of liberty of conscience that it lends more than an allusive importance to the letter of Erasmus,[29] in which he strongly intimates that it was neither More nor the Bishops who encouraged the proceedings against heresy, but Henry VIII. himself. Erasmus, in the confidence of the King, an intimate in the household of More a great deal of the time, was in a position to speak with knowledge and authority. What other meaning can we take from this letter, where he tells us that "he has it on good authority that the King is somewhat more severe to heresy than the bishops and the priests?[30] Jortin does not convey the full import of More's ideas when he tells us that "he makes it one of their [Utopian] maxims that 'no man ought to be punished for his religion;' the utmost severity practiced among them being banishment, and that not for disparaging their religion, but for inflaming the people to sedition; a law being made among them that 'every man might be of what religion he pleased.' "[31] More displays a deeper political sagacity, a wider human experience, a more observant legislative farsightedness. "Therefore all this matter [religion]," are his own words, which we modernize, "he [Utopus] left undiscussed and gave to every man free liberty and choice to believe what he would." When a fanatic inveighed against the Christian religion and began "to wax so hot in his matter that he did not only prefer our religion before all others, but also did utterly despise and condemn all others, calling them profane and the followers of them wicked and devilish and the children of eternal damnation," then, after fruitless efforts to bring him to his senses and ineffectual remonstrances to silence him, he was condemned to exile "not as a despiser of religion, but as a seditious person and a raiser up of dissension among the people. To do away with all dissension King Utopus issued a decree "that it should be lawful for every man to favor and follow what religion he would, and that he might do the best he could to bring others to his opinion, so that he did it peaceably, gently, quietly and soberly, without hasty or contentious rebuking and inveighing against others. If he could not by fair and gentle speech induce them into his opinion, yet he should use no kind of violence and refrain from displeasant and seditious words. . . . And this he surely thought a very unmete and foolish thing and a point of arrogant presumption to compel all others by violence and threatenings to agree to the same that thou believest to be true. Therefore all this matter he left undiscussed and gave to every man liberty and choice to be-

[29] *Epist. 426.* [30] ". . . *aliquanto minus aequum esse novis dogmatibus quam episcopos aut sacerdotes.*" [31] Jortin: "The Life of Erasmus," Vol. I., p. 172.

lieve what he would."[32] "By my soul," is the solemn reiteration of the same sentiment . . . "I would all the world were all agreed to take all violence and compulsion away upon all sides, Christian and heathen, and that no man were constrained to believe but as he could by grace, wisdom and good works induced; and that he that would go to God, go in God's name, and he that will go with the Devil, the Devil go with him." Continuing about heretics, he states what Maitland, Lee, etc., have proved beyond the shadow of a doubt, that "while they forbore violence, there was little violence done them," and that "never were they, by any temporal punishment of their bodies, anything sharply handled, till they began to be violent themselves."[33] This in clear, unambiguous and forceful terms explains More's attitude on heresy and the punishment of heretics.

More was too much of the statesman, too deeply conversant with human nature, not to realize, to borrow an illustration, that spiritual machinery at best turns out an indifferent article, that penal laws may teach conformity, but never conviction. The "outward sign" may be demonstratively exhibited, but the "inward grace" will be found lamentably absent.

But, continues the indictment of the Earl of Portsmouth, "men and women were taken and tried in Sir Thomas More's house at Chelsea and burned for their principles." James Bainham . . . [was] brought before More, who had him whipped in his presence . . . racked before his eyes!"

A rather exhaustive study of the subject, involving no little amount of laborious reading and painstaking research, traces the More myth to two sources—John Foxe, its parent, and James Anthony Froude, its last defender. Foxe and his Puritan confederates are the polluters of history whom Maitland, in words of burning indignation, pillories for stating "with great deliberation and solemnity . . . what they knew to be false; and that the manner in which such falsehoods were avowed by those who told them and recorded by their friends and admirers is sufficient evidence that such a practice was not considered discreditable," men whom he arraigns with verified evidence "for reckless imputations of all the worst motives and the most odious vices."[34] The same Foxe Brewer charges with downright dishonesty and wilful tampering with documents.[35] The same Foxe Dr. Arnold, when professor at University College, Oxford, denounced "as a rampant bigot, and, like all of his class,

[32] "The Seconde Booke of Utopia," pp. 146-147. Cambridge, 1883. [33] A dialogue of Sir More, touching the pestilent sect of Luther and Tindal, C. IV., p. 76. London, 1530. [34] "Essays on Subjects Connected with the Reformation in England," pp. 2, 48. London, 1849. [35] "Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic," etc., Vol. I., p. 60.

utterly unscrupulous in assertion; the falsehoods, misrepresentations and exaggerations to which he gave circulation are endless."[36] The same Foxe and Wyatt, who are the Puritan myth-mongers whom Froude, in blind slavishness, follows if they buttress his theories, but on whose veracity he casts doubt and suspicion if they militate against them. It is hard to tell whether his language is apologetic or censorious when he tells us that these English Reformation oracles "were surrounded with the heat and flame of a controversy, in which public and private questions were wrapped inseparably together; and the more closely we scrutinize their narratives, the graver occasion there appears for doing so!" As for Foxe's modern protagonist, if we follow the sliding scale of the deplorable decadence and moral debasement of contemporaneous historical writing and reach the zero mark of peerless dishonesty we arrive at the name of Froude,[37] whose historical fictions are taken with no more seriousness by critical students than the quips of a mediæval court jester. Incidentally it may be of archaic interest that Luther[38] espouses the Puritan cause; but the Reformer was in that period of life when "as a controversialist"—we are quoting Canon Mozley—"he was literally and wholly without decorum, conscience, taste or fear,"[39] and therefore he can be charitably dismissed.

Lord Campbell, whose conduct of the Newman-Achilli trial gave an exhibition of anti-Catholic bias that shocked England, Protestant as it was, replies to the charge. "That More was present at the examination of heretics before the Council and concerned in subjecting them to confinement cannot be denied, for such was the law, which he willingly obeyed; but we ought rather to wonder at his moderation in an age when the leaders of each set thought they were bound in duty to heaven to persecute the votaries of the other."[40]

The case of James Bainham is worked up with unctuous rhetoric and imaginative fervor by Foxe,[41] and in the deft hands of Froude[42] becomes a climacteric episode, full of dainty thrusts, telling side

[36] Quoted in *Catholic World*, Vol. XV., p. 567. [37] "It was a calamity to himself" is the language Augustus Jessop uses in summing up Froude's historical knight errantry; "it was a great misfortune to English historic literature, when Mr. Froude, nearly forty years ago, became possessed by that historic delusion which he has never been able to shake off, of which he is now the unhappy victim, and which, like all fanatics, he is passionately desirous to impose upon all who will listen to his pleading. More than thirty years of argument and criticism and evidence the most irresistible and convincing to all cultured intellects except his own, of new light coming from the right hand and the left, of documentary proof accumulated from the archives of almost every country in Europe, and pointing all to the same conclusions, have been wasted upon him." . . . *English Historical Review*, April, 1892, p. 360. [38] "Sämmtliche Werke," Vol. LXI., p. 365; LXII., p. 347. [39] "Essays Historical and Theological," p. 378. [40] "The Lives of the Lord Chancellors, etc., of England," Vol. I., p. 448. [41] "Book of Martyrs," Vol. IV., p. 702 et seq. [42] "History of England," Vol. II., 89-90.

plays, cunning suppressions and artful distortions, until the *tout-ensemble* reveals More to us as a heart-chilling, soul-paralyzing ogre. Fortunately More himself has shed some light on this charge. "Let us"—we again quote Lord Campbell—"let us hear what is said on this subject by More himself, allowed on all hands . . . to have been the most sincere, candid and truthful of men:" "Divers of them have said," is the sobbing pathos of the man whose cheerful wit did not desert him under the glistening blade of the head-man's axe, "that of such as were in my house when I was Chancellor I used to examine them with torments, causing them to be bound to a tree in my garden and then piteously beaten. Except their sure keeping, I never else did cause any such thing to be done unto any of the heretics in all my life, except only twain; one was a child and a servant of mine in mine own house, whom his father, ere he came to me, had nursed up in such matters and set him to attend upon George Jay. This Jay did teach the child his ungracious heresy against the blessed sacrament of the altar, which heresy this child in my house began to teach another child. And upon that I caused a servant of mine to strip him like a child before mine household for amendment of himself and ensample of others. Another was one who, after he had fallen into these frantic heresies, soon fell into plain open frenzy, albeit he had been in Bedlam, and afterwards, by beating and correction, gathered his remembrance. Being therefore set at liberty, his old frenzies fell again into his head. Being informed of this relapse, I caused him taken by the constable and bounden to a tree in the street before the whole town, and there striped him until he waxed weary. Verily, God be thanked, I hear no harm of him now. And of all who ever came into my hand for heresy, so help me God, else had never any of them any stripe or stroke given them so much as a fillup in the forehead."[43] "More, if any man," says the writer in the *Quarterly*, "may be believed on his bare word,"[44] and this should summarily dispose of this charge.

But it may be demurred that More himself admitted, even gloried, in his severity to heretics, for did he not write his own epitaph, in which he tells us—*furibus, homicidis, hæreticisque molestus*—that he was troublesome to thieves, murderers and heretics?

"But this," in the words of Professor Gairdner, who will give our reply, "is really not very difficult to answer. Suppose that instead of a Lord Chancellor of England," he continues, with incisive

[43] "Apology." C. 36, "English Works," p. 902, ac. Campbell ut. sup., pp. 447-448. [44] *Quarterly Review*, October, 1896, p. 362.

logic, "it were the case of a respectable gamekeeper who was compelled for one reason or other to give up his employment? Suppose that such a one were to say to a friend, 'You may write upon my tombstone that I served my master faithfully for many years to his entire satisfaction, and that all honest men about me held me in good esteem; but that I was very troublesome to thieves, murderers and, above all, to poachers?' Here you have precisely the same ascending scale that you find in the epitaph More wrote for himself; but it would not imply that even a gamekeeper considered that poaching, especially poaching from mere thoughtlessness or ignorance of the law, was quite as bad a thing as robbery or murder. It would only mean that the gamekeeper's duties brought him into direct collision with poachers, but that occasionally he had to deal with some of the most desperate characters, as indeed poaching, a wrong thing in itself, was very apt to lead on to worse things. So also Sir Thomas More"—we cannot refrain giving the quotation in its entirety—"as Chancellor had but little to do with the ordinary administration of the criminal law, but we know that he sat a Commissioner for the suppression of heresy and heretical books. And I presume that as a leading member of the Privy Council he must have heretics sometimes brought before him in the Star Chamber. In fact, Erasmus extols his clemency in that, having the power of putting men to death for heresy, he strove only to cure their mental condition and prevent the spread of the evil. For it was difficult to deny that, judged by its fruits, heresy was a very real evil in those days. . . . In England it was publishing scurrilous pamphlets full of the most shameful falsehoods and irreverence. It was no more a theological evil than Mormonism. More hated it with all his soul, and did his utmost to suppress it by means strictly humane as well as legal."[45]

Would not the epitaph More wrote for his father be a most apposite and truthful one of himself, when he describes him

"*Homo civilis, innocens, mitis misericors, æquus, et integer,*"

which his great grandson feelingly paraphrases "a man courteous and affable, innocent and harmless, meek and gentle, merciful and pitiful, just and uncorrupted?"[46]

That Gairdner stands not alone in his belief of More's complete innocence, but that he reflects the consentient opinion of modern English historians, men who have skimmed the froth and scum from history's stream and sounded and analyzed its undercurrents, is convincingly evident from the judicial pronouncement of a man

[45] *Academy*, 1891, p. 491. [46] "The Life of Sir Thomas More, Cresacre More," p. 9. London, 1838.

who, in his endeavor to trace these calumnies to their source, "has searched every contemporary document that could be found," says one of the most authoritative of English reviews, "and who is beyond the suspicion of misrepresenting facts."[47] This man, Paul Friedmann, examining the charges brought against More, says: "These accusations against More have been repeated by some later writers, but there is not a tittle of evidence that he was guilty of the cruelties imputed to him. Such charges conflict with all that we know of his character and his modes of thought, and to his contemporaries they were absolutely incredible. Henry gained nothing by the attempt to tarnish the fame of one whose virtues were so widely known and so cordially appreciated."[48]

Thus we see that under the most searching criticism and piercing scrutiny, Protestant writers alone having been laid under contribution, Sir Thomas More's innocence of the charge of persecuting heretics becomes an historical fact proved to actual demonstration. The calumnies which for centuries tried to blacken and blast his reputation will be tearlessly, even joyously, consigned to their final resting place beside the other bleached, dessicated bones in the charnel house of John Foxe's consecrated falsehoods, beyond the possibility of a transient galvanization, beyond the hope of an ephemeral resurrection.

As for More, the resistless sweep of historical truth, the avenging hand of retributive justice, the almighty power of a justifying Providence, will not only elevate him to a niche where he shall be hailed as "the glory of his age," a reluctant tribute that even Burnet pays him, enshrine his memory as one of the greatest geniuses and benefactors of his country, but lift him to the apex of the world's Immortals, where few loom over him, and viewing his social, political, judicial and spiritual virtues, still fewer dare stand beside him. For in what Englishman do we find such a prodigal combination of the most soaring human attributes as in More? "To say that Sir Thomas More was the brightest character of the age in which he lived, an age which exhibited the ferocity of uncivilized man without his simplicity, and the degeneracy of modern times without their refinement, were praise beneath his merit; to challenge the long and splendid series of English biography to produce his equal at any period might be deemed presumptuous; but if the wise and honest statesman, the acute and incorrupt magistrate, the loyal but independent subject, constitute an excellent public man; if the good

[47] *Edinburgh Review*, January, 1886, p. 61. [48] "Anne Boleyn: A Chapter of English History," Vol. II., p. 88. London, 1884.

father, the good husband and the good master, the firm friend, the moral though witty companion, the upright neighbor, the pious Christian and the patient martyr, form a perfect private character—*ecce homo.*"[49]

H. G. Ganss.

Carlisle, Pa.

"THE SACRIFICES OF MASSES."

THE REFORMERS AND THE CATHOLIC DOCTRINE.

"IT is often urged, and sometimes felt and granted, that there are in the Articles propositions or terms inconsistent with the Catholic faith; or, at least, when persons do not go so far as to feel the objection as of force, they are perplexed how best to reply to it, or how most simply to explain the passages on which it is made to rest."

With these words the Rev. J. H. Newman opened the famous Tract 90, which was intended both to allay the scruples about subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles then beginning to be felt by his followers, and at the same time to test how far the authorities of the Church of England were prepared to go in allowing the promulgation of the new teaching. The Tractarian leaders, like their predecessors and models—the Caroline divines—were diligent students of the ancient fathers. And like those divines, too, they had come to see that the Reformers had erred grievously in their successful attempt to root out from the English Church the very notion of an objective sacrifice, leaving nothing in its place but the offering of ourselves, our lauds and thanksgivings. The writings of the fathers had taught them to regard some external sacrifice as of the very essence of religion, of an adoring recognition by the creature of His Creator. They were ready to echo the plaint of the Catholic Dr. Scot, speaking against the reintroduction in Elizabeth's reign of the Prayer Book and the consequent abolition of the offering of Christ, "taken away by this booke, as the authors thereof do willingly acknowledge; cryinge owte of the offering of Christe oftener than once, notwithstanding that all the holie fathers do teach it, manifestly affirmynge Christe to be offered daylye after an unbloody manner. But if these men did understand and consider what dothe ensue and followe of this their affirmation, I thinke they wolde leave their rashness and return to the truthe again. For if it be trewe

[49] "Portraits of Illustrious Personages of Great Britain." Edmund Lodge, Vol. I., p. 41. 8 vols. London, 1849-1850.

that they say that there is no externale sacrifyce in the Newe Testament, then dothe it follow that there is no priesthood under the same, whose office is, saythe St. Paul, 'to offer up gyfts and sacrifices for synne.' And if there be no priesthood, then is there no religion under the New Testament. And if we have no religion, then we be 'sine Deo in hoc mundo;' that is, we be without God in this worlde. For one of these dothe necessarily depend and followe uppon an other."[1]

With such belief in their minds the Tractarians set themselves to the task of overcoming the obstacles presented by the wording of their Church's formularies. They took for granted that the Church of England was an integral part of the Church Catholic. Any formulary, therefore, accepted by her must be capable of interpretation in a Catholic sense. "Had it [a Catholic sense] not been provided for, possibly the Articles never would have been accepted by our Church at all."[2] Nor were they concerned to prove that this Catholic sense was intended by the actual framers of the Articles. They were quite ready to admit the utter Protestantism of the chief Reformers, whose only object in leaving the Articles ambiguous was "to comprehend those who did not go so far in Protestantism as themselves."[3] "The framers have gained their side of the compact in effecting the reception of the Articles, let Catholics have theirs, too, in retaining their own Catholic interpretation of them. . . . The Protestant confession was drawn up with the purpose of including Catholics; and Catholics now will not be excluded. . . . We could not then have found fault with their words; they cannot now repudiate our meaning."[4]

We have quoted thus at length from Tract 90 to try and make evident the bona fides with which the Oxford men set about their difficult task. The first feeling of a Catholic, when he hears of an attempt to make the Thirty-first Article harmonize with the Sacrifice of the Mass, is one of disgust and irritation at the seemingly manifest insincerity of the interpreter. Is it not beyond dispute, he exclaims, that the Reformers abhorred the very name of sacrifice, loathed and trampled upon the Mass and stereotyped their hatred of it in those blasphemous words: "The sacrifices of Masses, in which it was commonly said that the priests did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits?"[5]

All that may be true, replied the Tractarians, yet "it is a duty which we owe both to the Catholic Church and our own to take our reformed confessions in the most Catholic sense they will admit;

[1] Cardwell: Hist. of Conf., p. 111, ed. Oxf., 1841. [2] Tract 90. [3] Ibid. [4] Ibid. [5] Art. xxxi.

we have no duties towards their framers. . . . The interpretation [Anglo-Catholics] take was intended to be admissible; though not that which their authors took themselves."[6]

According to this view the Reformers, whilst in their hearts rejecting any external sacrifice whatever, so framed their article that it might be understood as rejecting only that which all England, and all genuine Catholics, too, would fain see rejected. "On the whole, then, it is conceived that the Article before us neither speaks against the Mass in itself, nor against its being an offering, though commemorative, for the quick and the dead for the remission of sins; especially since the decree of Trent says that 'the fruits of the Bloody Oblation are through this most abundantly obtained; so far is the latter from detracting in any way from the former; but against its being viewed, on the one hand, as independent of or distinct from the sacrifice on the cross, which is blasphemy, and, on the other, its being directed to the emolument of those to whom it pertains to celebrate it, which is imposture in addition."[7] "It was the 'sacrifices of Masses' [that was spoken against], certain observances, for the most part private and solitary, which the writers of the Articles knew to have been in force in time past,[8] and saw before their eyes, and which involved certain opinions and a certain teaching."[9]

This interpretation met with instant and vehement opposition from the authorities of the Anglican Church. But as it was felt to be vitally necessary for the Anglo-Catholic position, it was stoutly defended, *e. g.*, by Dr. Pusey and Dr. W. G. Ward. And it has been maintained by the High-Church party ever since, though with considerable variation in important details from its presentment in Tract 90. It will not be without profit to note these at the outset. Newman was ready to admit that the framers of the Articles were themselves opposed to any external sacrifice, but so worded Article 31 that it might be interpreted as condemning only abuses in practice and errors in teaching offensive to all good Catholics. The abuses were connected with the chantry system and stipend Masses, and were of long standing, having "crept into the Church these many hundred years." The erroneous doctrine was that the Mass was an offering independent of the cross.

W. G. Ward[10] seems to agree with his leader as to the inner mind

[6] Tract 90. [7] Ibid. [8] "What dens of thieves the churches of England have been made by the blasphemous buying and selling the most precious body and blood of Christ in the Mass, as the world was made to believe, at dirges, at months' minds, at trentalls, in abbeys and chantries, besides other horrible abuses which we now see and understand . . . all such fulsomeness and filthiness, as through blind|devotion and ignorance hath crept into the Church *these many hundred years*."—Homily on repairing churches (quoted in Tract 90.)
[9] Ibid. [10] "A Few More Words in Support of No. 90," Oxford, 1841.

and spirit of the framers; yet he attributes their repugnance to a sacrifice to ignorance, not to a deliberate heretical intent such as apparently animated Luther. "On the subject of the Mass, the quotations brought forward from Cranmer and Ridley in the *Edinburgh Review* make it to my mind a good deal more probable that they really mistook the doctrines held by the Church on the subject."[11] Then, after a quotation from Cranmer which we shall here have occasion to use presently, Mr. Ward adds: "So writes the 'Father of the English Reformation:' whatever other feelings may rise in the mind of the religious reader on perusing the passage, this is plain that he altogether misunderstood the sacred doctrine he opposed, and was even in his own despite, in this instance at least, preserved from any direct 'fighting against God.' "[12]

The words of Bishop Forbes, of Brechin, indicate a similar view on his part with regard to the Reformers. After quoting largely from St. Catherine of Genoa's treatise on Purgatory, he says: "Had this been even *an* aspect of Purgatory, presented to the minds of the framers of our Articles as a possible authoritative exposition of the doctrine, who would say that 'the Romish doctrine of Purgatory' would ever have been censured in it?"[13] And of Article 31 in particular he writes: "It is probable that the English Reformers were not conversant with the Eastern Liturgies, otherwise we cannot conceive how they could have preferred the Second to the First Book of Edward, or have rested content with the emendations at the beginning of the reign of Elizabeth."[14]

On the other hand, there were apparently some who felt that to attribute to the Reformers an intention of doing away with every kind of external sacrifice would endanger the Anglican position. Accordingly we find Dr. Pusey holding[15] that the writers of the Article had the "private special Masses" mainly in view and only included the "public Mass" so far as it agreed with them in the doctrine that it was Christ Himself who was offered and that such offering *specially* benefited the individual chosen by the priest. That this particular kind of oblation was the only one intended to be condemned Dr. Pusey considers evident from the fact that Bishop Ridley "states his objection to the Romish doctrine of the sacrifice to be founded on the error of Transubstantiation: 'Transubstantiation is the very foundation whereon all their erroneous doctrine doth stand;' and '*This kind* of oblation standeth upon Transubstantiation his cousin-german, and they do both grow upon the same ground.'

[11] "A Few More Words in Support of No. 90." Oxford, 1841, page 62. [12] Ibid. [13] XXXIX Art., ed. 1868, p. 350. [14] Ibid, p. 602. [15] "A Letter to the Rev. R. W. Jelf, D. D." Oxf., 1841, pp. 62-65.

And the celebrated dictum of Bishop Andrewes, which has passed almost into a proverbial statement of the principles of our Church, is but a following out of this of Bishop Ridley, 'Do ye take away from the Mass your Transubstantiation, and we shall not long have any question about the sacrifice.' Bishop Jewel also in like words states this to be the only point at issue. 'St. Cyprian . . . saith not as you say, we offer up *the Son of God substantially and rcally* unto the Father. Take away *only this blasphemy* wherewith you have deceived the world, and then talk of mingling the cup and of the sacrifice whilst ye list.' "[16]

Dr. Pusey is evidently in favor of rejecting Transubstantiation, whereas Newman, Ward and Forbes, whilst not openly professing their belief in it, try to give to the Anglican declaration in Article 28 a sense which would not exclude the Catholic doctrine. Since those early days the more prudent example of Dr. Pusey has been generally followed, viz., of maintaining the "orthodoxy" of the chief Reformers. Thus *e. g.*, Messrs Denny and Lacey, in "De Hierarchia Anglicana," do their utmost to show that the doctrine of the Real Presence was held by them and that they by no means intended in Article 28 to reject the Roman doctrine of Transubstantiation as the mode of that Presence. In the latest work on this question,[17] the Rev. B. J. Kidd adopts in the main Dr. Pusey's position both as to the "orthodoxy" of the Reformers and also as to the "ratio" of that "orthodoxy," viz., the rejection of Transubstantiation. We think that examination of the Reformers' writings and acts puts beyond doubt the accuracy of Newman's judgment that they, in their hearts, were opposed to *any* external sacrifice. With respect to Dr. Ward's contention that they rejected the Catholic doctrine because they misunderstood it, we think that this is true in the sense that they had a clear knowledge of the doctrine itself, but could not perceive how it could be reconciled with the fundamental fact that Christ's death upon the cross is the all-sufficient price of man's redemption. We will give some quotations in proof of these two points. 1. *That they were fully acquainted with the true Catholic doctrine.* In a "Confutation of Four Romish Doctrines"—a work attributed to Bradford and his fellow-exiles during Mary's reign—we read: "How concerning the sacrifice they teach that, 'though our Saviour Himself did indeed make a full and perfect sacrifice, propitiatory and satisfactory for the sins of all the whole world, never more so; that is to say, bloodily, to be offered again, yet in His supper He offered the same sacrifice unto His Father, but unbloodily; that is to say, in will and

[16] "A Letter to the Rev. R. W. Jelf, D. D.," Oxf., 1841, pp. 64, 65. [17] "The Later Mediæval Doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice." Church Historical Society, 1898.

desire, which is accounted often for the deed, as this was. Which unbloody sacrifice He commanded His Church to offer in remembrance of His bloody sacrifice, as the principle mean whereby His bloody sacrifice is applied both to the quick and the dead; as baptism is the mean by the which regeneration is applied by the priest to the infant or child that is baptized."[18]

It is equally evident that Cranmer himself had before his eyes the true Catholic doctrine free from all alleged errors and excesses. He thus quotes the argument of Bishop Gardiner:

"This is agreed and by the Scriptures plainly taught that the oblation and sacrifice of our Saviour Christ was and is a perfect work, once consummate in perfection without necessity of reiteration, as it was never taught to be reiterate, but a mere blasphemy to presuppose it. It is also in the Catholic teaching, grounded upon the Scripture, agreed, that the same sacrifice once consummate was ordained by Christ's institution in His most holy supper to be in the Church often remembered and shewed forth in such sort of shewing, as to the faithful is seen present the most precious body and blood of our Saviour Christ under the forms of bread and wine; which body and blood the faithful Church of Christian people grant and confess, according to Christ's words, to have been betrayed and shed for the sins of the world, and so in the same supper represented and delivered unto them, to eat and feed of it according to Christ's commandment, as of a most precious and acceptable sacrifice, acknowledging the same precious body and blood to be the sacrifice propitiatory for all the sins of the world, whereunto they only resort and only accompt that this very perfect oblation and sacrifice of Christian people, through which all other sacrifices necessary on our part be accepted and pleasant in the sight of God."[19]

To this Cranmer replies:

"For answer to all that you have here brought . . . the reader need not to do more but to look over my book again, and he shall see you fully answered beforehand."[20]

In that "book" he had written:

"It is a wondrous thing to see what shifts and cantels the popish antichrists devise to color and cloke their wicked errors . . . For the papists, to excuse themselves, do say that they make no new sacrifice, nor none other sacrifice than Christ made (for they be not so blind but they see that then they should add another sacrifice to Christ's sacrifice, and so make His sacrifice imperfect;) but they say that they make the selfsame sacrifice for sin that Christ Himself made.

[18] Writings of Bradford—Letters, Treatises, etc. Parker Society, p. 270. [19] Cranmer, On the Lord's Supper. Parker Society, p. 344. [20] Ibid.

"And here they run headlong into the foulest and most heinous error that ever was imagined. For if they make every day the same oblation and sacrifice for sin that Christ Himself made, and the oblation that He made was His death and the effusion of His most precious blood upon the cross for our redemption and price of our sins, then followeth it of necessity that they every day slay Christ and shed His blood, and so be they worse than the wicked Jews and Pharisees, which slew Him and shed His blood but once."[21]

Cranmer knew, too, that the Catholics taught that no new redemption was wrought by this sacrifice of the altar, but that, as Bradford had written, it was a mean, like baptism, whereby the bloody sacrifice could be applied to quick and dead. For in his defense of the Catholic doctrine of the sacrament the fourth error with which he charges the papists is that "they say that they offer Christ daily for the remission of our sins *and distribute and apply the merits of the Death of Christ* by their Masses."[22]

It is beyond dispute, then, that the Reformers were acquainted with the true Catholic doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Mass, and that they deliberately rejected it even in its pure, authoritative form as Newman thought. 2. And undoubtedly they did this because, as Ward surmised, *they misunderstood it;* they were unable to see that it in no way derogated from the all-sufficiency of the cross, nor introduced a new redemption. Their theological incapacity led them into the paths of heresy. In this they are more excusable than the heresiarch Luther. We have his own confession that for years he deliberately set himself to overthrow the Mass, and this against the clear light of his reason. At first he had to confess that the Scripture was too strong for him. It was only when he had excogitated his theory of consubstantiation that he saw his way to undermining the doctrine of the sacrifice. Then he began to instruct his English friends,[23] who, more logical than he, ended in Calvinistic tenets on this matter of the Real Presence and sacrifice.

It may seem strange that men who, at least before they became utterly Solifidian, recognized the necessity of the sacraments as means to apply to us the merits of the Passion should find insuperable difficulty in accepting the sacrifice of the altar even under this same ratio of a means. But we must remember that there is a great difference between the sacraments and the sacrifice. According to the Catholic doctrine Christ was truly present—whole Christ—in the latter and He was present in virtue of the priest's act: present, too, in a victim condition. Thus there was in the Mass a true sacrifice,

[21] Cranmer, On the Lord's Supper. Parker Society, p. 348. [22] Ibid, appendix, p. 25. [23] " . . . the Germayne wryters, the cheffe schoolemasters and instructors of our countreymen in all these novelties." Abbot Fecknam :Cardwell's Conf., p. 101.

a real offering of Christ to His Father. If this were so, then, as Bishop Harold Browne remarks,[24] "no other sacrifice could be compared with it. It must far exceed in glory and in value everything besides." If it be really in the priest's power to offer to the Father the beloved Son, then necessarily the Father must be "well pleased by such offering: it becomes, in fact, a propitiatory sacrifice. Here lay their difficulty. They could understand the sacrifices of the old law, for these had only an *imputed* propitiatory virtue: the victims were but brute beasts or fruits of the earth having in themselves no power to placate the wrath of God; therefore they in no way impugned the sufficiency of Calvary. But this sacrifice, if Christ were really there mystically immolated, must have a propitiatory, placatory virtue of its own, and so would become either the rival of or a supplement to the sacrifice of the cross. We shall have to deal with this difficulty again. Here a few words must suffice. Catholics have no difficulty in recognizing that every act of Christ when He was upon earth, that is, *in statu viatoris*, was infinitely meritorious *in itself*, and, *had God so chosen*, would have sufficed for the redemption of the world, *e. g.*, His incarnation, circumcision, crowning with thorns or scourging. The choice, by divine decree, of the Passion and Death as the sole ultimate cause of redemption, its formal price, did not deprive those other acts of the God-Man of their individual merit, neither did their being meritorious *in se* derogate from the supreme excellence and sufficiency of the Passion. This would hold good of the oblation with Mass, too, even if it were a meritorious act *in se* and could be considered independently of the Passion. But it is, as a matter of fact, neither meritorious *in se* nor independent; for it is the act of Christ as *comprehensor*, not *victor*, and the perpetual representation of that past act—His death upon the cross. It has infinite, infallible efficacy to propitiate God just because it is that death mystically perpetuated, unceasingly pleaded.

Luther had thought to get rid of the sacrifice by his doctrine of consubstantiation, and he did so, at least in any ordinary sense of "sacrifice." For an act that is merely *unitive*, and in no way "*destructive*," does not fulfil the conditions required by the notion of sacrifice. Thus we do not call the unitive act of the Incarnation a "sacrifice." But in 1552, when the Articles were first put forth, the English Reformers had outrun their Lutheran comrades and determined to make once for all an utter end of the sacrifice by denying to the priest any power of causing Christ to be present, whether by consubstantiation or Transubstantiation or any other way. The

[24] Exp. of the Articles. Third ed., p. 741.

believing communicant alone had power to draw Christ down, and that only at the moment of manducation. In their judgment to claim the power of "offering Christ" was a blasphemy, to claim a sacrificial priesthood was a lie. Thus Cranmer:

"All such priests as pretend to be Christ's successors in making a sacrifice of Him, they be His most heinous and horrible adversaries. For never no person made a sacrifice of Christ, but He Himself only. And thereforth St. Paul saith that Christ's priesthood cannot pass from Him to another."[25] And Ridley:

" 'By His own person He hath purged our sins.' These words, 'by His own person,' have an emphasis and vehemence which driveth away all sacrificing priests from such office as sacrificing, seeing that which He hath done by Himself He hath not left to be perfected by others."[26]

There remains one other point to be considered before we leave the Tractarians for their successors of to-day. Newman based his claim to taking the Articles in a Catholic sense on the supposition that some of the Reformers were not so far gone in Protestantism as their leaders, and would have interpreted the Articles as he himself wished to interpret them. Whatever force this plea may have with regard to such doctrines as Protestants themselves were divided upon, we do not think it can be urged as applying to this Article 31. We know that Gardiner and those who thought with him strained every point to prove the First Book of Edward VI. "patient" of a Catholic interpretation. But the only result of their efforts was their own deposition from office and the issue of the thoroughly Protestant Second Book. By the time the Articles came forth there were none of Catholic dispositions left in any important office. Neither they nor the clergy in convocation were given any opportunity of expressing their views upon the Articles, for they were issued by the King's authority alone. Moreover, as the Reformers' instinct truly told them, the doctrine of Transubstantiation was the very root and foundation of the sacrifice; and this doctrine was held in abhorrence by all save the Catholics. And this state of mind continued, perhaps we may say deepened, as time went on, so that when the Articles were reissued in 1562 and again in 1571, the authorities in Church and State were as far as ever from approximating to any notion of a true sacrifice in the Eucharist. We have already seen what Jewel and Andrewes had to say upon this matter. The highest point ever reached by Anglican divines before our own days was probably that of John Johnson in his work on "The Unbloody Sacrifice"—and that asserts no more than a sacrifice of the bread and wine.

[25] On the Lord's Supper, p. 348. Parker Society. [26] Works, p. 107.

We have mentioned the recorded attempts of Gardiner and a few others to read Catholic doctrine into the First Book of Edward VI. When similar evidence is adduced of like attempts to claim an ambiguity for this Article, whether in Edward's reign or Elizabeth's, then we might consider that the contention of Tract 90 had something in its favor. As things are, we cannot but believe that the Article was accepted in the full sense of its framers, especially seeing that, at its reissue in 1571, it enjoyed the running commentary of penal laws, dungeons, tortures and death, which left no room for doubt as to the sense in which it was then promulgated by the convocation of the Established Church.

II.

THE CHURCH HISTORICAL SOCIETY ON ARTICLE XXXI.

Tract 90 and its defenders, Ward and Pusey, made little or no attempt to prove the existence of the alleged erroneous doctrine of the sixteenth century by quotations from Catholic writers of that period. Dr. Pusey, indeed, takes the doctrine of so late a writer as Lessius as being the one which Anglicans protest against. But modern Anglicans of the extreme school accept such doctrine as the true one. Accordingly their efforts have been directed to finding an erroneous teaching in the writers of the sixteenth century itself or the period immediately preceding it. This was done by Messrs. Denny and Lacey in their "De Hierarchia Anglicana" in 1895. Perhaps because of this work being in Latin, and so not accessible to the many, and perhaps, too, because of the tacit acceptance therein of Transubstantiation, the Church Historical Society have thought fit to issue a little work[27] on this question more adapted to the capacities and views of the Anglican majority. The author, the Rev. B. J. Kidd, has not only utilized the material gathered for the previously mentioned work, but has added much new matter culled from various sources. We may conclude, therefore, that we have here the utmost that can be brought forward in support of the theory that, in the sixteenth century, there existed a practical system and its supporting doctrine so outrageous and so widespread as to justify steps which led to the severance of England from Catholic unity. The argument of Mr. Kidd's book is as follows: Attention is first drawn to the use of the plurals, *Masses* and *priests*, in Article 31. In two versions there is an addition of a third plural, viz., *sacrifices*, so that the article ran: "The *sacrifices* of *Masses* in which it was commonly said that the *priests* did offer Christ," etc. This use of plurals where singulars might have sufficed leads our author to enquire whether there

[27] "The Later Mediæval Doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice."

was any system and doctrine current in the sixteenth century to the indication of which the plurals were meant to point. Such a system he finds in the numerous chantries, etc., which tended to multiply *Masses* beyond measure and so to increase the number of *priests*. Behind this practical system, and affording it a theological support, he detects a widespread theory that each Mass was a new sacrifice of Christ distinct from, perhaps independent of, the sacrifice of the cross; also that this new sacrifice had a definite, quantitative value of its own, which could be applied in a "mechanical way," at the mere will of the priest, to the remission of so much sin or punishment incurred by the individual for whom it was to be offered.

This theory, he considers, has in it elements utterly foreign to the primitive idea of the Eucharistic sacrifice which was enshrined in the definition given by St. Isidore of Seville (A. D. 595-636). "It was simply this: Sacrificium dictum quasi sacrum factum, quia prece mystica consecratur in memoriam pro nobis Dominicæ passionis. Such a view can scarcely be called sacerdotal."[28]

This definition, we are told, prevailed until the days of St. Thomas Aquinas (A. D. 1224-74), who added to it a novel theory about the necessity of some physical change taking place in the thing offered if it was to be properly termed a sacrifice. Thus was laid the foundation of later doctrines on the victim-condition of Christ in the Mass. Nor was this the only innovation made by St. Thomas. In certain statements, "scarcely more than *obiter dicta*," he prepared the way for his successors, the later scholastics, to assign to the priest undue prominence in the offering of the sacrifice and to exalt the act of consecration at the expense of the people's communion. Furthermore, there was a passage in the Fourth Book of the Sentences (dist. xii. qu. 2 a 2 ad 4) out of which was evolved by later writers a theory that the sacrifice could operate in a way that can best be described as "mechanical" or "of the nature of a magical charm."

The fully developed form of these errors had taken possession of the popular mind and even of theologians in the sixteenth century. It was against this pernicious doctrine and superstitious system that the denunciations of Article 31 were leveled, not against the true "primitive and Catholic" doctrine of the sacrifice of the Mass.

The widespread hold of these errors is abundantly proved, says our author, by the testimony of English and foreign Reformers, as also by the admissions of "Romanensian" theologians of eminence—*e. g.*, Melchior Canus, Cajetan, Vasquez and Suarez.

Finally, there may be traced a continuous "growth of the theory that sacrifice involves destruction," from the days of the Council of

[28] P. 43.

Trent to our own times, though the writers on this subject are not agreed amongst themselves, but fall into two classes, viz., "the maximizers, who agree in holding that in some sense Christ is destroyed or suffers change in each Mass," and "the minimizers, who either ignore the need for such change altogether or explain it as virtually affecting merely the material elements." These are the chief points in Mr. Kidd's argument.

Considered in itself, this new attempt, like all its predecessors, to turn the flank of that uncompromising Article 31 is a matter of purely domestic concern for Anglicans. It may therefore be asked why Catholics should trouble themselves at all about it. One chief reason is that Anglicans, in their efforts to prove their own communion orthodox, find it necessary to represent the Catholic Church as negligent or dilatory in guarding the purity of the faith. For this reason, if for no other, we think we have a right to "interfere" in this particular phase of the internecine strife of the Established Church.

For clearness' sake we will resume in a few brief heads the charge which we conceive Mr. Kidd now brings against our forefathers. According to his view, therefore, the current popular system and much of the current theology of the sixteenth century taught:

1. That there was in the Mass an immolation (an "induced victim-condition") of Christ, distinct from (some said independent of) His immolation on the cross.

2. That this immolation constituted a true sacrifice, not merely *impetratory*, but propitiatory also.

3. That it had a certain quantitative value which

4. Could be set over against so much sin (culpa) or so much punishment (pœna).

5. That it could be applied to individual cases at the will of the offerer.

6. That it operated in a merely mechanical way, like a magical charm.

Such were the features which it is supposed the Reformers condemned and rejected in Article 31 as forming a pernicious accretion upon the idea of the sacrifice prevalent before the days of St. Thomas Aquinas.

III.

SUMMARY OF INDICTMENT AND EXPLANATION OF TERMS.

We shall now set down as briefly those points of the above indictment which we *allow* to have existed in the current theology of the sixteenth century, and *maintain* to have been the Church's teaching

from the beginning. At the same time we shall indicate those points which are neither primitive nor Catholic, and show that they are falsely imputed to our forefathers. We allow, then,

1. That in the Mass there is an immolation of Christ *distinct* from His immolation upon the cross. We deny that it was ever currently held to be *independent* of the latter.

2. That this sacrifice is truly *propitiatory* as well as impetratory.

3. That considered absolutely (*absolutè*), as being the offering of Christ to His Father, its value is *infinite;* but its *efficiency*, as determined to this or that individual case, is *finite* and therefore *quantitative.*

4. That this sacrifice avails for obtaining the remission of sin (culpa) and of the temporal pœna due for sin.

5. That the special fruit of this sacrifice is determined to individual cases by the priest's intention, and that it is infallibly received by those individuals provided they have the requisite "disposition."

6. That this sacrifice, by reason of its intrinsic excellence, produces its effects *ex opere operato: immediately*, with regard to the remission of *pœna; mediately*, with regard to the remission of *culpa.*

A few words of explanation before we begin the proof of our position. When we say that a sacrifice is not only *impetratory*, but propitiatory as well, we mean that it not only *asks and obtains* of God remission of sin, etc., *as a favor*, but *demands it as a right*, as a matter of justice, and at the same time appeases His just anger. It depends solely upon the will of God what sacrifice shall have this power. In the present order of Providence it is the self-offering of His Divine Son.

We may institute a parallel between the virtue of the Passion and its application to individual souls and the virtue of the Mass and its application. Considered absolutely—*i. e.*, in itself, as the *opus operatum*—the Passion is of *infinite* virtue; it would *suffice* for the remission of each and every sin and of all the punishment, eternal and temporal, due for sin. As a matter of fact, its *efficiency* will never be extended to the sins of the rebel angels nor to those sins for which the wicked will be condemned to hell. Its efficiency will extend to the remission of the whole *eternal pœna* of the saved, but they themselves will have expiated, in their own persons, much of the *temporal pœna* they have incurred. Thus, viewing redemption as a whole, we see that the Passion is *infinite in sufficiency* and in *undetermined efficiency*, but in *determined, i. e.*, actually *applied, efficiency* it is limited.

So again, if we consider the virtue of the Passion as it is applied to individual souls, we see that it is *infinite in sufficiency*, but *limited in*

determined efficiency, since it produces not an infinite but a finite effect in each soul. We shall find that this also holds of the sacrifice of the Mass; but we must first consider its relation to the Passion. The ordinary means appointed by God for communicating to us the virtue of the Passion are the sacraments and the Eucharistic sacrifice. Each *sacrament* produces its own special effect in the soul; that is, it determines in this or that way, as a *secondary* cause, the infinite virtue of the *primary* cause, the Passion. The sacrifice of the Mass resembles both the Passion and the sacraments. Like the latter, it is one of the means or secondary causes by which the virtue of the Passion is applied to individuals. And in one respect its excellence as a means exceeds that of any sacrament: for these have narrower limits of application determined by the specific character of each, whereas the sacrifice of the Mass avails for countless needs as well of body as of soul. It is of well-nigh universal applicability. None but the already damned are beyond the reach of its aid. This surpassing excellence as a means is due to its most intimate connection with the Passion. It is the mystical renewal of Christ's death; it is the true, though unbloody, immolation of the same Victim by the same Priest as were found on Calvary; it is the oblation of Christ by Himself, and as such is infinitely pleasing to God. The Passion is the *ultimate cause* of God's being propitiated as regards mankind at large, and of His being willing to shower blessings upon them; the Mass is, like the sacraments, the *proximate cause* of His being propitiated *hic et nunc* towards this or that individual, and of His actually conferring this or that grace, of remitting this or that sin or punishment.

Now, considered absolutely—*i. e.*, in itself, as the *opus operatum*—this offering of Christ is of infinite virtue for propitiating God and demanding the application, in all their fullness, of the merits of the Passion. But when this infinitely meritorious *opus operatum* is applied by the priest's intention to an individual (as by administration he applies a sacrament), the actual effect produced is finite in its extent, whether that effect be some grace conferred or some *pœna* remitted. Therefore we say that the value of the Mass, *as applied to some individual case*, is finite, of a certain limited amount (though only God knows its extent), or, if you will, it is *quantitative* in value.

From one point of view every Mass is a "good work" performed by the *Church*, since the priest is her minister. Consequently every Mass brings God's blessing upon the whole Church and every one of her members. This fruit of the Mass is called by theologians the *fructus generalis*. As all members of the Church partake of it, so in

a special manner do those who are actually present at its offering—the assistants at the altar and the congregation.

But the Mass is also the personal "good work" of the *priest* who offers it; and, like all other "good works," it brings a special blessing upon the doer. This is called the *fructus specialissimus* of the Mass.

Again, God has made us in some sense our "brother's keeper," his helper. As we learn from the story of Sodom and Gomorrha, God is willing to accept the "good works" of just men as a counterbalance of the evil deeds of others. In the Christian Church this communion of saints, this participation in the good works of one another acquires a much stronger foundation in the fact of the unity of all the baptized in Christ (I. Cor. xii., 25-27). And even as God accepts our prayers for one another, so also He accepts the offering, on behalf of individuals, of our "good works." The most acceptable to Him of all possible "good works" is the offering of that sacrifice which is, at one and the same time, the actual oblation of the mystically slain Christ and the memorial of that supreme "work"—His death upon the cross. This, too, then, can be offered on behalf of some given individual, or for some particular purpose.

There remains one other word to be explained—that bugbear of Protestants, *ex opere operato*. Perhaps a great deal of the mystery supposed to enshroud this term and its antithesis—*ex opere operantis*—may be due to slight variations in their signification necessitated by regarding an action from diverse points of view. An example or two will be the best way to explain them.

Suppose I give a sum of money to a man. My act may be good or bad, according to the motive from which it proceeds. I may do it from mere natural pity, and that is good; or from true Christian charity, and that is incomparably better; or to effect some evil purpose, and this would be a sin. The mere giving the money, *i. e.*, the mere *opus operatum*, is in itself a thing "indifferent," neither good nor bad, worthy of neither praise nor blame. *Ex opere operato*, then, the act has no value. It is only as it proceeds *from me* that it acquires "virtue:" its "value," whether for merit or demerit, depends *ex opere operantis*, upon my doing it with good or bad intent.

Another example. A heathen King has issued an edict for the putting to death of every child who shall have received baptism. A man, wishing to injure his neighbor, takes the latter's child and baptizes it with the intention of afterwards procuring its death. Provided that he used right matter and form, and intended to do what the Christians did, that child certainly received the inestimable boon of sanctifying grace, of divine sonship. Yet the act, or "opus," *considered as the miscreant's*, was fiendish; *ex opere operantis* it was a

heinous sin; but the *opus operatum*, the baptism considered absolutely in itself, was an "opus" having "virtue," which "virtue," by God's appointment, was inseparable from it and capable of effecting spiritual regeneration in any infant or "disposed" adult notwithstanding the wickedness of the minister. In other words, the effect was produced *ex opere operato*, by virtue of the "opus" itself, and not *ex opere operantis*, by virtue of the doer.

Using this same example of baptism, we have now to notice a slight change in the application of the two terms *ex opere operato* and *operantis*. Catholics, and a large number of non-Catholics, believe that baptism really and infallibly effects the spiritual regeneration of *infants*. Yet the infant does not *actively* contribute anything to the production of this effect; it may be asleep or unconscious at the moment of baptism. Whatever is effected in its soul is due to the sacrament, the "*opus operatum*:" *i. e.*, the sacrament operates *ex opere operato*. Thus we see that this term is used in contradistinction to *ex opere operantis* not only when the latter signifies the *doer*, but also when it signifies the *recipient* of an "opus."

Moreover, an "opus" is said to produce its effect *ex opere operato* not only when, as in the case of the infant, the recipient actively contributes *nothing*, but also when he contributes something which yet is not sufficient of itself to produce the effect. Thus an act of *perfect contrition* suffices, without the sacrament of penance, for the remission of mortal sin in one who, at the moment, cannot have recourse to a priest, or is under no immediate obligation to do so. An act of *attrition*, on the other hand, does not suffice by itself for the remission of mortal sin, but it does constitute a sufficient "disposition" for receiving absolution in the sacrament of penance, which absolution, in remitting the sin, is said to act *ex opere operato* by its own "virtue." The penitent, by his *attrition*, removed the impediment to the working of grace, he turned his will from sin, he "disposed" his soul for the grace which the sacrament conferred.

From this it will be evident that when we say a sacrament, or whatever else, works *ex opere operato*, it by no means follows that there is no need for some "disposition" on the part of the recipient. The nature of the "disposition" varies for the various sacraments, and for the various mental developments of the recipients—*e. g.*, infants, idiots, sane adults. Unless there be a moral certainty of the presence of such "disposition," it would be both useless and sacrilegious to administer a sacrament. Hence the unfairness of the charge against Catholics, made in the Apology for the Confession of Augsburg, that they hold "quod *per ceremoniam* justificemur, sine bono motu cordis, hoc est, sine fide;" and repeated in the English "Thirteen Articles" of 1538, "Neque . . . verum est, quod qui-

dam dicunt, sacramenta conferre gratiam ex opere operato sine bono motu utentis." There is a sense and there are cases in which Catholics, and non-Catholics, too, maintain this; there are others in which they reject it. Faith is not required of an infant for baptism, nor a "bonus motus" of the minister, beyond the bare intention to administer the sacrament validly. For absolution, a "disposition" or "bonus motus," at least to the extent of true attrition, is absolutely requisite on the penitent's part. In the sense in which the Reformers, English and German, made this charge, it was absolutely untrue; and Mr. Kidd is mistaken in supposing that the Council of Trent "quietly omitted to say anything in support of 'sine bono motu utentis,' and dropped all allusion to it." On the contrary, in so far as it was untrue, they said: "Quamobrem falso quidem calumniantur catholicos Scriptores, quasi tradiderint, sacramentum Pœnitentiæ absque bono motu suscipientium gratiam conferre, quod nusquam Ecclesia Dei docuit nec sensit." Sess. xiv., c. 4.

Having now cleared our terms from all ambiguity, we could in other papers, if time permitted, and occasions presented themselves, deal with the chief points raised by our author. Our first task would be to show that St. Thomas and his successors, whether mediæval or modern scholastics, in claiming for the Eucharistic sacrifice a true immolation, a true propitiation for sin and *pœna*, and applicability by the intention of the priest, were in perfect accord with the primitive fathers. Then we should examine the four Catholic witnesses adduced by Mr. Kidd to prove the widespread acceptance of a gross and pernicious theory of the sacrifice. The passage ascribed to St. Thomas and the case of Catharinus could be dealt with in a separate article. It would not be necessary to deal explicitly with the question of the sacrifice of the Mass being *distinct* from that of the cross; for an immolation which differs in time, place and mode from another must *ipso facto* be distinct from that other.

J. F. Besant, S. J.

St. Asaph, Wales.

THE "COUNCIL OF TEN" SYSTEM IN IRISH NATIONAL EDUCATION.

SOME remarkable admissions recently made by persons in authority have thrown a ray of white light on the system known by the rather misleading title of National Education in Ireland. For more than half a century that hapless country has been the theatre of experiments on the spiritual and intellectual framework of its people at the hands of doctrinaires and theorists utterly out of sympathy for the most part with their genius, their religious convictions and their higher aspirations in all fields of thought and human activity. Impressed with a full sense of the importance of education as an agency for moulding the destinies of large masses of mankind, their maladroit influence and ability were for a long period persistently devoted to the hopeless task—as it proved—of weaning the youth of the country from those ideals in religion and political development which had for centuries been the Irish tradition. Clearly perceiving that the tendency of modern civilization rendered the introduction of a universal system of education for the people a thing inevitable, the framers of the original scheme determined to lay its foundations on such a principle as would be certain, in their limited view, to divert the minds of the rising generation, and the succeeding ones, into such channels as would be favorable to the eventual Anglicization of the country by detaching it from those influences which had hitherto frustrated all attempts to plant the religion of England among the Celtic population, and at the same time, by the banishment of Irish history from the schools, draw a veil of oblivion over a past so full of incitements to bitter memories and noble emulation as the story of a strangled nationality which the truthful chronicler must certainly unfold. One of the chief architects of the National system was the celebrated Archbishop Whateley; and his confession, posthumously published, laid bare the motive which actuated him. It was to wean the Irish youth from the religion of their fathers. This artless avowal can hardly be said to have been instrumental in any considerable degree in the defeat of the astutely-conceived idea. The quick wit of the people themselves enabled them to detect it at a very early stage of the experiment. The religion of the Irish is still cherished steadfastly by what remains of its Celtic population, while the wealthy and powerful Protestant Establishment of which he was the

gifted representative has, thanks to the energy of the Irish population, been laid in the tomb of all the Capulets.

Hardly more successful has been the dogged persistency in the vicious course of ignoring the national history of the country. That plan was steadily persisted in down to a couple of years ago. Not a syllable that would shed light upon the glorious past of Ireland before the English conquest, or on the causes of its melancholy decline under foreign rule, was ever permitted for more than half a century to get into a book issued under the sanction of the so-called "National Commissioners." At length the force of public opinion broke down in some measure the defenses of the ostrich-headed system. A handbook of Irish history, prepared somewhat on the Bowdlerized Shakespeare plan by the skilful hand of Dr. Joyce, was at last placed upon the list of works supplied by the National Board.

Concurrently with this obscurantist policy in regard to the history of their own land, there was developed a cunning design to glorify the country and the people who had imposed the yoke on the neck of Ireland. Poems in praise of both, pitched in the key of "A happy English child," were artfully introduced, together with occasional soul-stirring historical references in prose composition. At the same time a sort of negative proselytism, by means of Scripture quotations and religious maxims, was sought to be carried out in the early text-books, prepared under the able guidance of Archbishop Whateley and his sympathetic collaborators on the National Board. The Catholic representation on that board in the beginning was almost nil. Hence the "National" system was fiercely denounced by such stanch defenders of faith and nationality as the great Archbishop McHale. Several of his brother prelates were equally outspoken on the subject, and forbade their flocks, under penalty, to patronize the new schools. Seeing the probable failure of the whole grand scheme through persistence in this janissary policy, the Commissioners modified their methods so far as to give an equal representation of Catholics and Protestants on the Board, but this was not done until after the system had been a considerable time in operation.

This cursory outline of the beginnings of the National system is necessary, especially in the United States, because of the adoption of a similar policy of hiding away the truth on the part of those intrusted with the task of enlightening the American public on the progress of public education in other countries. Not one who ever read the Reports of our Bureau of Education could ever glean from them a knowledge of the real state of the case from the

carefully prepared and elaborate statements published by that department of our Government. It would, however, be unjust to impugn the *bona fides* of the Commissioner for this defect. Of course the official at the head of the department could not of his own knowledge do any better than he did. He had to take the reports presented by persons whom he believed sufficiently impartial and competent to prepare reliable papers on the subject in the many fields of inquiry which his annual reviews embrace.

Educational problems in no place can be regarded as in a state of rest, not to say finality. They may be considered rather as a series of experimental advances, in which the views of one set of thinkers prevail for a time and then give place to others arguing from a different base of generalization. "*Experimentum fit in corpore vili*" seems to have been the motto whose spirit commended itself to the early devisers of the present Irish system. In Ireland the Catholic people had for a century and a half been in the position of a criminal on the rack. The aim of their "Sworn Tormentors" did not merely seem, but really was, to discover how much the Catholic Celt could endure in the way of moral degradation and physical suffering before his reason gave way or his spirit was broken to the point of submission to the torturer's will. It was the same determination which forbade him, in the penal days, to acquire knowledge of letters that in the more liberal age laid down the law as to what he should learn and what he should not. This is where the iron of foreign domination enters the soul of the vanquished. It is the very essence of slavery that out of the taxes wrung by force from a conquered people, what is administered to them for their mental sustenance is not that for which their souls hunger and thirst, but that which their despot thinks likely to further his own concealed designs. The Act of Parliament which in 1831 began what it called the National Education system for Ireland was in spirit and intent as much a penal law as any passed in the reign of Elizabeth or William of Orange. So, too, was the law of Sir Robert Peel which called into existence the trinity of Queen's Colleges known as the Godless. It is not because Ireland is a little place remote from these shores that its struggles with the English Kulturkampf have no interest for us; far from it. They are a microcosm of the vastly larger developments here, and the results of the struggle, by the laws of mental sympathy and vibration, must in time be felt upon our own intellectual littoral. The most crucial stage of the struggle appears to be at hand now, and the final triumph of the principle for which the indomitable Irish Catholics have contended, even when the last rays of hope seemed

to have departed from Ireland's horizon, seems to be nigh. There is on foot a movement to reconstruct the whole National system—a movement so far-reaching and momentous as to justify the Archbishop of Dublin—always a very cautious prelate—in styling it a revolution.

Not from the outside, it should be noted, has this startling effect been produced. There has been no agitation of late years in Ireland, save for some alterations in matters of administration and the relations of teachers to school managers. It is the system itself which confesses its helplessness to keep pace with the impulse of the age. Progress it finds impossible along lines laid down for conditions which have become obsolete. The rails are there, but the sleepers are rotten and the permanent way awry and sagged.

One very striking point in the criticism of the Irish National system which we find embodied in the United States Educational Report, 1890-91 (the most important one in the brief series), is the shrewdness with which the anonymous writer detected the flaws in the system, considered from a practical working standpoint. Looking at what is now transpiring, as we shall shortly describe, the remarks appear to be almost prophetic:

"In the theoretical elaboration of the system . . . apparently no detail has been overlooked. Judged from the American standpoint, the system would seem to be entirely wanting in the force and spirit of spontaneous action. Nothing else gives a system so strong a hold upon the sympathies of a people nor such powerful effect upon their development. Systems wanting in this element have the character rather of expedients than of deep-rooted institutions, and to this general rule the Irish system is no exception. Its results as a practical expedient may be judged from several particulars.

"The average daily attendance maintained in the schools is low, being, as already noted, but ten per cent. of the total population, forty-seven per cent. of the total enrollment and fifty-nine per cent. of the average annual enrollment. This is explained in part by the sparse population of many districts, the poverty of the people and the absolute demand for the help of the children in agricultural regions. The failure of the system to modify class distinctions is due in some measure to the fact that it has little attraction for the rural gentry of Ireland."

There was insight in this judgment, as will be seen, but all was not visible to the keen critic who passed it. There were hidden springs of disorganization, and these are now being laid bare by the force of public events. Not long ago Mr. Charles Redington,

the able and accomplished successor of Sir Patrick Keenan, died, and the post of Resident Commissioner was bestowed upon the present occupant, Dr. Starkie. The functions of Resident Commissioner constitute him the executive head of the system. He carries out the general policy of the honorary Commissioners, but his advisory power is also a great factor in the determination of the problem. In this case it would seem that the transformation about to be effected has been decided upon entirely through the Resident Commissioner's action, and if this be so the importance of having one man with a head and a heart at the helm, instead of twenty-one (the number of the present Board), must irresistibly suggest itself. Dr. Starkie recently delivered a speech on the state of the educational machinery—a thing almost unprecedented in his office—and pronounced the doom, because of the failure, of the present worn-out methods. He did not indicate the nature of the substitute which had been devised, but its character is sufficiently perceptible from the comment of the Archbishop of Dublin. "It is not a reform," said His Grace, "but a revolution."

All this has arisen over the recently issued Report of a "Royal Commission of Manual Instruction." This body, since its appointment, had gone into its work of inquiry so thoroughly, with the help of the Resident Commissioner, that there was no possibility of hiding the unworkable articulation of the old ramshackle pile. The stage coach of the Georges' days is no more fit to draw a modern passenger train than the antique construction thrust on the Irish people for the work of directing present-day school ideals.

The point most emphasized by Dr. Starkie was the impossibility of local initiative under the existing system. Its chilling influence leaves no choice of action to either managers or teachers. This rigidity both in rules of school management and educational syllabus is condemned by the Archbishop, by Dr. Starkie and by the Manual Instruction Commission by the description of "cast iron." It leaves no room for what the American commentator deems requisite—"the force and spirit of spontaneous action." The Archbishop is hopeful that this deadening influence is near its end. The Royal Commission will insist upon the necessity of altering it *in toto*. "The system administered by our Board," the Archbishop declares, "must be either a system of centralization or one affording abundant scope for intelligent local initiative." Now, the Report of the Manual Commission, he insists, has made the continuance of the centralized system impossible. There is, to all appearances, then, no alternative for the Government but to give up the control of the schools, a function which it had never the slightest moral right to assume, and retire into the position of mere distributor of

the public funds in this respect. Blatant bigots and ignoramuses prate and write about the overweening ambition and despotic spirit of the Church where the control of the minds and the consciences of the people is concerned. Did they ever cast a thought on, did they ever know, of this prolonged endeavor of an impersonal succession of alien officials in London to compel the intellectual part of a people into the channels it would not run in and to weaken their faith in the ancient religion for which their fathers suffered martyrdom?

It is difficult to imagine the sources of such crass reasoning as impels statesmen and governments to cling to the notion that they can fight against moral forces with cast iron rules and mere physical weapons. It had long been seen in England that the central plan was unworkable in regard to the general education of the people, and accordingly the local control principle found full embodiment in the creation of the School Board system more than twenty years ago. How it could be imagined that the plan which had failed in England and Scotland, where the people are in harmony with the governmental power and the religion of the country, could be successfully maintained in Ireland, where the conditions are entirely reversed, it is hopeless to conjecture. Despotisms seem to be subject to the law of compensations. As a makeweight to the advantages they enjoy, as the fruits of arbitrary rule, they appear to inherit by nature a double dose of stupidity.

Another feature of the National system in Ireland, ushered in with a great flourish and a loud "Eureka" a quarter of a century back as something both novel and practical, was the rule of paying by "results." By making results' fees portion of the teacher's salary it was thought to stimulate the energies of both teacher and pupils by an infallible recipe. The results system, however, was emphatically condemned by the Royal Commission. Under "that wretched system," as it was styled by the Archbishop, the inspectors became only inspectors in name. Examination afforded no real test of the capacity of either pupils or teachers. To make the income of the teacher depend upon the greater or less degree of parrot power of the children or the temporary state of their nerves at examination times seems like a piece of capricious cruelty.

But the real "dead hand" at the apex of the "National" system was the grasp of the English Treasury on its purse-strings. This Treasury is a thing constructed on the principle of a cash register. Its mental equipment is marked by the same absence of soul or conscience as one of those clever mechanical contrivances. No public expenditures can be made in Great Britain or Ireland save

through the hands of this Treasury in London. Every docket which signifies money must be viséd and certified by this universal paymaster before it can be honored anywhere. But the Treasury is more than a supervisor of expenditures. It is also a controller and an investigator for whose "why" there must be always forthcoming a satisfactory "because" before payment is furnished. No change in the system of results' fees could be made without obtaining the consent of the Treasury—unless, indeed, the teachers were prepared to give up the million dollars a year which is the Government's contribution to the results' system. On this point the Archbishop's statements are more than emphatic—they are decidedly original and picturesque. "It is a discouraging thing," says Dr. Walsh, "and it necessarily has a very deterrent effect to feel beforehand that one can do nothing unless he can succeed in first instructing and then converting to his views a number of people whose very identity is unknown to him, who live, in fact, during official hours, cloaked and masked, behind a sort of screen in London, like the judges we read of in the tribunals of the old Venetian republic. It requires no small stock of persevering determination to take such a thing in hand at all. This deterrent effect of the system is its worst feature, and Lord Salisbury spoke words of weighty truth in what he said in the House of Lords a few weeks ago: 'The exercise of its powers,' he said—that is, of the powers of the Treasury—in governing every department of the Government is not for the public benefit. I think much delay and many doubtful resolutions have been the result of the peculiar position which, through many generations, the Treasury has occupied. I do not assume that it is only in large measures the difficulty was produced. But salutary reforms are built up by a long series of useful changes. Individually they are small, but in the aggregate they are large; and here I think the control of the Treasury has done harm. I think it has had the effect of discouraging, of impeding and of taking away the freedom and diminishing the initiative of the respective departments. I think it is an evil. Much of the immobility of the departments is, I think, due to the existence of that control."

A striking parallel, truly, that of the secret Venetian tribunals and the procedure of the English Treasury. The terrible "Council of Ten," the secret executioners, the Bridge of Sighs and the awful dungeons below the water and under the *piombi* all at once rise up in dread phantasmagoria before the mind's eye. The closest moral similarity exists between those agencies and methods of mediæval despotism and those employed in London to repress the right of the Irish people to free education after their own ideals.

Step by step, ever since the foundation of the system was laid in the minds of Stanley, who began it in 1831, and Peel, who completed it in 1840, the Government have had to recede from the original design. By sheer tenacity the people were enabled to secure such modifications as by slow evolution transformed the system from a Godless unelastic three R's arrangement to one of denominational education in practice. The local manager in the Catholic district is the parish priest; in some Ulster parishes, the Episcopal or Presbyterian minister. These respectively arrange the amount and the time of religious instruction in the various schools. A "conscience clause" protects the rights of those parents who, though obliged by local circumstances to send their children to schools where the religion of the majority dictates the form of the spiritual exercises, elect to have them go without any or depend upon home training in whatever form they prefer.

What share the great teaching body, the Irish Christian Brothers, have had in compelling this alteration of purpose is an equation with too many unknown quantities for any one to essay. But with the certain action of the pole upon the magnetic needle, their policy caused the ship of state to swerve in her course. Their fine schools, established early in the century, were equipped with the best apparatus, handled by the ablest scholars. The teachers were all picked men, full of that sympathetic power which is essential to the successful pedagogue. In their great halls the courses were carried out with clock-work regularity, and the most perfect order and decorum were maintained apparently without an effort on the part of those in charge. The exercises of religion took place at stated hours, before its quickening symbols exhibited on the walls. The morning's work was opened with prayer; the half hour for play was preceded by the devotion of the midday Angelus; and the afternoon dispersal did not take place until after thanks for the day's work done. The personal and affectionate interest taken by many of these whole-souled teachers in their pupils contributed another powerful guarantee for success beyond the staff of the National schools, who, lacking in the religious incentive which spurred the Christian Brothers, lacked the moral qualities which were its outer denotements. Had the Brotherhood not been compelled to charge a small weekly fee and to demand more for their text-books than those supplied by the Government to the National schools' pupils, they must have been far more successful still in diminishing the attendance at the new establishments. But this was unavoidable. Ireland was at the time steeped in appalling poverty, and the resources of the Brothers were jejune indeed. But as it was, they

educated many thousands of boys every year, for they had exceedingly spacious schools in Dublin, Cork, Waterford and other large centres. The Government soon perceived the formidable character of this obstacle to the grand scheme of de-Catholicizing and denationalizing. Besides teaching the fundamental principles of religion, the Brothers actually taught Irish history!—a most pestiferous derangement of England's programme.

A course of action was resolved on which leaves no doubt of the mind of the Government at this particular phase of Ireland's trials. The Christian Brothers were offered State aid for educational purposes, but on what condition? In effect that they would become accomplices of the Government in its secularizing scheme by stripping their schools of their religious emblems. If they would only eliminate the Cross and the Madonna and the images of the saints, they might have a proportionate share of the public fund. But an indignant refusal was the response to this temptation. The Brothers steadfastly persisted in their attitude whenever at various turns of the discussion on educational policy renewed opportunities of falling into line were politely offered them. This discreditable attitude was maintained toward the sturdy Brotherhood down to the passage of the last Bill for the improvement of the National system, supplementary to Sir John Gorst's much more liberally-conceived measure for England and Wales. Even a Minister so favorably disposed as Mr. John Morley could not be moved from a stubborn adherence to so unjust and paltry a position. Fair and equitable on all other great questions of Irish policy, he was immovable as a rock on this one point. A firm believer in the cold tenets of Mill and Herbert Spencer on the relations of the State toward public education, he could never be persuaded, while conceding that the special circumstances of Ireland demanded special methods of legislative treatment, to concede that any departure in this, the most important respect of all to her, was compatible with true statesmanship. To the firm stand taken by the Irish Nationalist members of Parliament the ultimate surrender of the Government on the point was due. Mr. Sexton, Mr. Dillon, Mr. Healy, Mr. W. O'Brien and other prominent men of the party brought forward arguments in their favor whose force it was impossible to withstand. As Mr. O'Brien said: "The Christian Brothers had practically the education of the whole Irish urban population in their hands, for their schools were situated in all the chief centres of population. The most influential men in every city and large town in Ireland had been their pupils. Their system was regarded in Ireland as the really national system. It was adapted

to the genius of the people, it was deeply grounded in their respect and affection." (*London Times*, March 23, 1892.) But it was not Mr. Morley or the Liberals who reluctantly displayed the white flag. The surrender came from the Unionists and the Tories. It did not come even from these until it had been demonstrated repeatedly, by the results of the Intermediate examinations, that the teaching system of the Christian Brothers was capable of achieving in secular fields of learning a perfection unsurpassed by institutions which had long enjoyed all the advantages of State favor and unlimited material resources.

Side by side with this absorbing chapter of heroic struggle for principle in the field of primary education should be placed the review of the cognate one for university rights for the Catholic people. But this subject would demand exclusive consideration. Yet it is impossible to repress the feeling of wonder at the weakness of a powerful Ministry which, while confessing the justice of the Catholic demand through the mouth of its responsible spokesman, shrank from the duty of conceding it in act because of the bigoted opposition of a miserable handful of Orange and Presbyterian anti-Irishmen and the clamor of a section of English Nonconformists and secularistic Radicals. So humiliating an exhibition of moral weakness is not to be found in all the history of political vacillation.

Many eminent statesmen resort to the ingenious idea in vogue in the old French Court for the benefit of offending Dauphins—a vicarious penitent whose back should bear the punishment to which the genuine delinquent had been sentenced by stern governess or preceptor. Mr. Balfour, who must feel in a bad plight over his ignominious surrender on the Catholic University question, appears to have fallen back upon this clever notion. He has a faithful henchman in the head of the Irish Local Government Board, Mr. T. W. Russell. This official, although a Scot by birth and a Presbyterian by religion, is yet a Liberal Unionist as to politics. As a Liberal Unionist he was pledged, when seeking his seat for South Tyrone, to the removal of every Irish grievance, to satisfy every reasonable demand of Ireland short of the restoration of an Irish Parliament. Mr. Russell is a conscientious kind of man, in his own way. He has felt bound to support the demand for a Catholic University on the merits of the case; but he sits for a constituency in which the Orange and Presbyterian elements are in a slight majority. The time for a new general election is drawing nigh, and Mr. Russell's time of embarrassment with it. He has been offered seats in other parts of the United Kingdom, he declares, but he prefers to

represent South Tyrone, if South Tyrone only prefer him. The fact that a seat in any place outside Ireland would not qualify Mr. Russell for the retention of the comfortable post he now holds as head of the Irish Local Government Board he does not deem it the part of good taste to allude to, because, probably, he deems the wit of his constituents equal to the delicate problem he thus negatively puts before them. It is this University question, he shrewdly judges, which is the centre of the coming battle—the key of the position. "Nobody," he declares, in a public letter to his constituents—"nobody at the present moment can very well say what the position of the University question really is. Judging by appearances, Mr. Balfour's proposals or views have not met with the full approval of the authorities of the Roman Catholic Church. If I am right in this supposition we should be fighting in Tyrone upon an issue that may not become practicable during the next Parliament."

This is not a very ingenuous statement of the premises. Mr. Balfour made no definite proposals on the subject. He merely put forward a series of tentative questions, with the purpose of eliciting a statement of the lengths to which the Irish hierarchy were prepared to go on the subject of lay influence on the controlling board of the contemplated University. The Bishops' reply was clear enough. They were satisfied to have an adequate representation of lay scholarship: they could give no more definite answer to a query very vague and fishy in its terms. Therefore Mr. Russell's plea—which may be regarded as Mr. Balfour's apology, in view of the official and political relations between the two politicians—is entirely creditable to the former's skill in dialectical subterfuge. Whatever public correction or castigation it may draw forth, Mr. Balfour, by his silence, escapes the whipping; and thus the wisdom of the French Court method will be triumphantly vindicated. At the same time Mr. Russell saves his own reputation for perfect *bona fides* and sportsmanlike magnanimity. "Elect me again," he says to the South Tyrone voters, "and if the Catholic University question reach the stage of proposed legislation, I will then resign and submit myself to the judgment of my constituents on this particular question." This incident furnishes a clue to the singular gyratory action of the Government from time to time on questions of gravest importance to Ireland. Men are put into office who go there to learn the business called statesmanship, and to acquire the statesman's conscience. They may have the most profound conviction, in their private capacity, of the justice of certain popular demands, but when they find, by exposition, that their principles are not

acceptable, in some regards, to their constituents, they willingly submit them to alteration. Every step taken by the English Government with regard to public education in Ireland has borne the impress of this spirit. Between the necessity and justice of the case, on the one hand, and the weight of popular prejudice in England on the other, the conscience of the statesman—whenever he happened to have any—was as between the upper and nether millstones. It is not, under the circumstances, going too far to say that the principle of action disclosed in Mr. Russell's letter appears to be that on which Mr. Balfour has proceeded ever since the discussion over the Catholic University question was reopened; and Mr. Russell is only proving his devotion to his exalted model by tendering him the delicate flattery of imitation.

The fact is that the policy underlying the withholding of a Catholic University despite the reiterated insistent demands for one is the very same policy that has always been acted on in Ireland since the time that statesmen began to see that it was the duty of the State to educate the people. It is not what the people claimed and hungered for that was to be given them, but what their English masters deemed good for them. Dr. Starkie, breaking away entirely from the traditions of his predecessors, stated the case bluntly, without either disguise or palliation, in the memorable speech at Glasnevin which has given the discussion a new and irresistible impulse. The "National" system was alien in spirit and unsuitable to the genius of the Irish people, he declared. It was an attempt to graft foreign ideals upon a race entirely out of sympathy with the people who offered it and sought perforce to fasten it permanently upon unwilling recipients. And now it is discovered that, even taking it as a system designed to nullify and refrigerate the religious and national ideals of the Celt, it is unworkable, reactionary and useless even from this point of view. "I was but a very short time attending the meetings of the National Board," remarks the Archbishop of Dublin, "ere I found how hopeless it was to effect any reform, because of the fact that the smallest change was impossible without the consent of some unknown Treasury clerk in London." These are not exactly His Grace's words, but they exactly reflect his complaint. "It is not a reform which is coming, but a revolution." This will be news indeed to that large class of easy-going people who have year by year been imbibing their knowledge of the educational status of the Irish people through those carefully-compiled and apparently authoritative literary productions called Parliamentary blue books. The language of these compilations never would lead the reader to suspect that there was

the smallest hitch or friction in the motion of the huge piece of mechanism held together with an ingenious mesh-work of red-tape. Take, for instance, the statement of the case furnished to our own Commissioner by the unknown expert who drew up the special Report already referred to—*i. e.*, for 1896-97. It is the soul of blandness and respectable impartiality, as these passages will show:

"The principles controlling the policy of the British Government with respect to popular education already referred to, *i. e.*, the sense of public responsibility in this matter and immemorial regard for local prerogative and private rights, have been displayed in a striking manner in the system of National education maintained in Ireland since 1831. The growth of the system has been phenomenal; the schools which in 1834-35 numbered 1,106, with an enrollment of 145,521, or 1.8 per cent. of the population, having increased to 8,298 in 1890, with an average enrollment of 828,520 pupils, 17.6 per cent. of the population. The ratio of average daily attendance to the population at the later date was 10 per cent., or more than five times the ratio of enrollment to population in 1835. The annual expenditure which in 1883 was estimated at £47,224 ($229,509), and which it was supposed would ultimately reach a fixed sum of £200,000 (about $1,000,000), was actually in 1890 £973,062 ($4,729,082). The administration of the system is confided to a National Board of Commissioners appointed by the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland. The managers of schools, who are generally clergymen, come into immediate relation with this Board. There are no elected school boards, as in England and Scotland, nor do civil authorities appear in the matter at all.

"Several details pertaining to the internal conduct of schools, which in Great Britain are left to local managers, are in Ireland entrusted to the Board of Commissioners (*i. e.*, the representatives of the Government). This policy grew out of the religious question, which presented the greatest obstacle to the development of a National system of education in Ireland. At the time of the organization of the system it was necessary to allay the jealousies which had been excited by previous attempts to force Protestant schools upon a population overwhelmingly Catholic. To this end a formal declaration was made on the part of the Government that its purpose was "to superintend a system of education from which should be banished even the suspicion of proselytism, and which, admitting children of all religious persuasions, should not interfere with the peculiar tenets of any.

"The sincerity of the Government with respect to this purpose was evidenced in the constitution of the Board, which comprised

eminent representatives of both Catholic and Protestant churches, and in placing under their control all matters affecting the subject of religious instruction. They were directed to separate literary and moral from religious instruction and to remit the latter subject to the clergy. All efforts to compel or to persuade the attendance of any child upon these exercises against the wishes of parents and guardians were strictly forbidden.

"The authority of the local managers is extensive and in most districts is reposed in one man, the priest, Presbyterian minister or other clergyman, as the case may be. He appoints and dismisses the teachers, arranges the daily time-table of the school and determines the character of the religious instruction. A report of January 31, 1891, shows that 48 per cent. of school managers at that date were Roman Catholic clergymen; 30.5 per cent. clergymen of the Episcopal Church; 18.1 per cent. Presbyterian ministers; 2.2 per cent. Methodist ministers."

The ordinary reader of this smooth sketch of the beginnings of the system never could glean the idea that there had been a fierce fight for the principle of Catholic representation on the National Board, or an insidious attempt at that proselytism so smoothly disavowed by the Government—nor of the determined stand of the Bishops and clergy which compelled the change in the ways of the "National" Board. Thus it is that history is written. It is part of the general method resorted to for the suppression of the part played by Catholicism in public education all over the world. Not one official Report that we have ever seen has taken the slightest notice of the wonderful work of the Christian Brothers in Ireland. Their name is never mentioned. Of what value, we may ask, is any return purporting to give the proportions between literacy and illiteracy in Ireland which omits the bearing which the figures of the Christian Brothers' school population must have on the question? In the particular report now under notice occurs the following statement:

"The recent census (1891) reveals a favorable view of the results of education in the country. The census commissioners observe that 'the progress achieved in both primary and superior instruction may be considered the most gratifying fact elicited by the census. In 1881 the percentage of wholly illiterate persons was 25.2, whereas in 1891 it reached no more than 18.4 per cent. Of the whole population above 5 years of age, 70.6 per cent. could read and write at the latter date, as compared with 59.3 per cent. in 1881. The addition to the number of schools and of pupils has been relatively small.'"

There is nothing in this passage to show that any returns but those of the National Board were consulted or sought for in the calculation of the school attendance; nor in these further particulars:

"The classification of pupils by religious denomination is important as showing the progress of the system in overcoming sectarian opposition. Every teacher is accordingly expected to enter upon his register the church relation of each child. Of the schools whose returns were summarized, 3,866 were mixed schools, *i. e.*, attended by both Protestant and Roman Catholic pupils, and 4,394 were separate schools, *i. e.*, attended by Roman Catholic or by Protestant pupils exclusively.

Mixed Schools.	Pupils.
Under Roman Catholic teachers exclusively	327,966
Under Protestant teachers exclusively	127,159
Under Roman Catholic and Protestant teachers conjointly	12,855
Total	467,980

"Of the pupils in separate or unmixed schools, 468,222 were Roman Catholic and under teachers of that sect, and 100,733 Protestant under Protestant teachers. The percentage of schools exhibiting a mixed attendance declines steadily from year to year, having fallen from 55.1 in 1881 to 46.7 in 1890."

Returns of such a character as the above are useful only in giving an approximate idea of the literary status of the population. The very large number of pupils in the Christian Brothers' establishments must, had they been tabulated, affect the relative proportions of Catholic and Protestant scholars, as well as alter the conclusion as to the comparative triumph of the "National" over the denominational system. In Dublin, Cork, Belfast, Limerick, Waterford, Galway and other places the Brothers' schools accommodate thousands of boys. In Cork they have three large schools in different parts of the city under their care, and some of the buildings have six different school-rooms for the purposes of grading and classification, and each of these rooms or halls may accommodate from three to five hundred pupils. The same is true of the schools in Dublin and other places.

A statement recently furnished by Brother M. M. Hill to the *Catholic World* shows that about thirty thousand children attend the schools of the community. About three thousand of that number are receiving intermediate education, the remainder primary. Mr. Hill's statement is exceedingly interesting, not only as a disclosure of the work the Brothers are doing, but as an exposure of the animus of the Government and the so-called National system. "The

programme of studies in our schools comprises Greek, Latin, French, Celtic, German, Italian, Mathematics in all its branches, Chemistry, Natural Philosophy, Type-writing and Shorthand, besides other studies which children in some localities require. All our schools are connected with South Kensington, so that drawing is universally taught. The Brothers receive no aid from Government for Primary Schools, and in my opinion one of the principal reasons is that our schools are the only National Schools in the country. The English Government does not favor a national education, as it is not favorable to having Irish history taught as it should be taught; nor does it favor denominational education, which is the system of the Irish Christian Brothers. The English Government has tendered no remuneration to Irish Christian Brothers. Some English statesmen essayed doing so, but failed. As to our status as teachers, as compared with the teachers of the Government, and also as to the success of our pupils at Civil Service, I may give a quotation from Lord Justice Fitzgibbon in 1894. (He is not a Roman Catholic, but he is a man of broad views and recognizes merit.) He said in the King's Inns at a debating society about two years since: 'The result was that after a certain number of years so large a proportion of Christian Brothers' unendowed schools were carrying off prizes that it was said the system was not high enough. The standard was raised for the purpose of excluding schools that had not a high standard of teaching. The schools that were squeezed out were those that thought they would remain in, and a larger proportion of Christian Brothers' schools than ever were successful when the standard was raised!' On another occasion His Lordship stated, before the Protestant Church Society, that if they (the Protestants) wanted to hold their own in Civil Service, they should organize their schools on the lines of the Christian Brothers, whose boys, His Lordship said, were taking a large percentage of places in the Civil Service."

That work of this kind has been done a half century and more without the help of a penny from the State is a truly surprising fact. But much more surprising still is it to know that official Reports and blue-books have been published all this time, year after year, without making the smallest reference to that fact, or hinting that any such agency was at work for the education of the Irish people in their own way and according to their own religious and national tendencies.

It should never be forgotten that the Christian Brothers could have had generous State help, long ago, were they only willing to conform to the State's idea of the function of education. All that

was needed was merely to remove the crucifix and the religious pictures from the walls and omit the prayers which three times a day intermit the work of secular teaching for both teacher and pupil. This offer was made to them more than once—under the régime of Mr. W. T. Forster, and again under that of Mr. John Morley. But the answer of the Christian Brothers was always an unfaltering "no surrender." On no account would they offer up incense to the gods of the modern paganism. They steadily held aloft the highest standard in education—highest in the moral sphere, highest in the secular.

It is little wonder that the Archbishop of Dublin found in the methods of mediæval Venetian judges a parallel for English methods in the field of Irish education.

One more anomaly remains to be noted in this connection, in order to a full understanding of the anti-National idea underlying the whole plan of the State system of education in Ireland. This is the dogged attempt made to extirpate the National language. When the system was first set in motion seventy years ago there must have been several millions of people whose only medium of thought was the Irish language. The children of such could not receive any instruction save through the vernacular. Yet no provision whatever was made for their instruction. It was this Irish-speaking population which furnished the chief holocausts to the Famine tribute in 1847, yet there remained, and still remains, despite the emigration drainage, a large section of the Irish-speaking peasantry—mostly on the western seaboard and in the mountain districts of the North. About thirty years ago a society was started in Dublin with the object of averting the extinction of the venerable and euphonious tongue of the Gael in Ireland, and its most difficult task in all the years since then has been to induce the "National Board" to aid in this most commendable undertaking. The driblet concessions which the Board made from time to time have always been of a niggardly and hampering character. So obstructive have been its tactics that a strongly-worded memorial, gotten up by Dr. O'Donnell, Bishop of Raphoe, and some hundreds of priests of the Irish-speaking districts, was recently presented. It is nothing short of a grave indictment. For instance, the memorialists say:

"We are convinced that primary education in our respective districts has hitherto been rendered gravely defective, and that the best results of education have been thrown away by the neglect to utilize Irish systematically as a part of the pupils' knowledge and as the natural medium of their instruction. The children of these

districts come from Irish-speaking homes, where all the familiar converse of life, still more, all the higher and more spiritual ideas are habitually expressed by their parents and elders in Irish. The first foundations and the most important part of the mental development of the children are thus naturally made in the Irish language. To ignore the utility of Irish in teaching these children from the outset is, in our opinion, a primary blunder for many reasons. It deliberately puts on one side all that the children may have learned not alone of the vocabulary of common life, but of the finer shades of thought and feeling which are eminently characteristic of the Irish language. Experience has shown that the native traditional taste for poetry and other forms of literature and for music is taken away from the people along with their native language. It often happens under the present system that after a number of years at school young people practically lapse into illiteracy and forget how to read and write simple English. Even of those who may seem to have profited more, a large number have little better than a mechanical proficiency, and from the standpoint of material advancement are hardly to be distinguished from the class of illiterates."

It is difficult to comprehend the obstructive policy of the National Board in this particular matter. Perhaps there was not policy, but only dislike of the language and a desire to avoid responsibilities for which the Board was not equipped. If, on the other hand, there was a policy, and that the idea was to help Anglicize the people gradually by this additional means, it was a singularly foolish one, for the keeping any people in ignorance only adds to the piled-up grievances which often eventuate in destructive outbursts. The Protestant missionaries were more astute. The Kildare-place Association had trained Irish teachers early in the field, and thousands of Bibles in Irish were distributed by the proselytizing societies in the Irish-speaking districts in periods of distress, besides tons of controversial literature also in the vernacular. Although the investment did not prove profitable, the design showed tactical genius. But the crass hostility of the National Board produced no result but a more profound dislike year after year of the alien system.

The upheaval which is now convulsing the whole system is the natural result of dogged persistence in a vicious course. For seventy years this coercive Board has been trying to educate the Irish people out of Irish ideals and Irish love of the ancient faith. That the means employed to further this dark design should in detail resemble those of the Council of Ten was only in keeping

with the principles of high art, as understood in the old text-books. But a new century is bringing new and perhaps truer ideals. The question is, is the Briton too old to learn?

JOHN J. O'SHEA.

[Since the foregoing pages were written the first official step toward a partial reconstruction of the lines on which the National system had been laid has been taken, and the fact is publicly notified. From the date of the notification, it is announced, the principle of payment of results' fees ceases, and in its stead will be substituted grants from the Treasury arranged according to classification. This is only one reform, and in a matter of financial detail more important to the teachers themselves than to the mass of scholars, but it is in the right direction. It will remove the tendency toward the "forcing" method of which the results' fees could not help being productive, and it will give the diffident pupils who may be just as clever naturally as their more alert and pushing companions a chance of getting their fair share of the teachers' attention. It is likely to operate also toward effecting a larger attendance, since the per capita principle stirs up the managers and the teachers to continuous effort to keep the attendance at as large an average as may be. The change will entail an additional draft on the Treasury, to the extent, perhaps, of a couple of hundred thousand pounds; but what can that trifle be to a Government which thinks nothing of squandering hundreds of millions upon wars and preparations for wars? The National Board also authorize some further concessions in the matter of the teaching of the Irish language. But these steps are only preliminaries. They are precursors of the larger changes, however, adumbrated by the Archbishop of Dublin, and satisfactory in so far as they intimate the conversion of the English Government from the reactionary and futile ideas upon which the whole National system was originally laid out. The system is at last seen to be a failure, and for this disillusioning the steady passive resistance of the people for nearly three generations is to be accorded the credit.—J. J. O'S.]

THE STORY OF THE SCOTTISH REFORMATION.

II. THE STORM.

THE return of Knox from the Continent in May, 1559, could scarcely have happened at a more opportune moment for the fortunes of his party. The Queen Regent awaited the arrival of the Protestant preachers at Stirling, while they with a large following were assembling at Perth, determined to resist. Erskine of Dun, one of the leaders, desirous of preventing harsh measures, went alone to the queen, having prevailed upon the Congregation to remain at Perth. Mary of Guise, while anxious to keep peace with the Protestant party, was unwilling to let the contumacious ministers go unchallenged. Erskine, therefore, with some others, became security for their appearance before her at the time appointed.

Meanwhile the preachers at Perth occupied themselves with the delivery of inflammatory sermons, which set forth "how odious idolatry was in God's presence; what commandment He had given for the destruction of the monuments thereof; what idolatry and what abomination was in the Mass."[1] At this crisis Knox appeared on the scene. There is little doubt that it was by his persuasions that the preachers decided to refuse to answer to the summons of the Regent; for, as he himself bears witness, he went to Perth "to assist his brethren" and "to give confession of his faith with them," and arriving among them, "began to exhort, according to the grace of God granted unto him."[2] When the preachers failed to appear, sentence of exile was passed against them, while Erskine and their other sureties were fined.

On the day after these events Knox assembled his followers in St. John's Church, and, as a contemporary writer says, "made such an excellent Sermon to them that he set their Minds, already moved, all in a Flame."[3] The subject of the discourse is given by Knox himself, although he does not mention that he was the preacher. "The sermon," he says, "was very vehement against idolatry."[4] At its conclusion, while "the most part were gone to dinner,"[5] as Knox takes care to state, a priest, somewhat imprudently as it would seem, entered the sanctuary and began to make preparations for offering the Holy Sacrifice at the high altar. As he unfolded what Knox

[1] Knox: "History of the Reformation" (ed. 1644), p. 143. [2] Ibid, p. 142. [3] Buchanan: "History of Scotland" (ed. 1752), Vol. II., p. 248. [4] Knox: "History," p. 143. [5] Ibid.

calls "a glorious tabernacle"[6]—probably a triptych adorned with paintings or images—a boy cried out, "This is intolerable, that when God by His Word hath plainly condemned idolatry, we shall stand and see it used in despite."[7] The priest, roused to indignation, gave the boy a blow; he retaliated by throwing a stone, which struck one of the sculptured images of the altar and broke it in pieces. This served as a signal to the people present. Already excited by the Reformer's sermon, the incident roused them to action. In a moment they threw themselves upon the pictures and carvings of the altars, the statues of the saints, the painted windows and all the other adornments of that glorious church and destroyed them utterly. The sumptuous building, with its forty altars, the pride of the "Fair City" and the origin of its familiar appellation, "Saint Johnstown," was left a wreck—stripped of everything that marked it as Catholic.

Knox, in his endeavor to shield himself and the Protestant leaders from blame, calls the perpetrators of these sacrileges "the rascal multitude" and "the common people;"[8] but, as an historian justly remarks, "when the feelings of an excited populace have been systematically roused, when at the very time exhortations to violence are ringing in their ears, when the act itself is neither checked nor punished, it is obvious that the multitude are not the worst criminals."[9] Yet some writers, carried away with admiration for their hero, acquit Knox of all blame. The reformer's biographer, Dr. McCrie, actually asserts that Knox "exerted himself in putting a stop to the ravages of the mob;"[10] it would be interesting to know what authority he has for the statement, as there is nothing in the way Knox relates the circumstances to warrant it.

Their appetite for destruction once whetted, the mob rushed to the other ecclesiastical buildings of the city to repeat the same scenes of desecration. For two days they hacked and hewed at crosses, images, paintings and windows of stained glass till every fair church and chapel was reduced to ruin. The Charterhouse had been founded by James I. and Jane, his queen, in 1431, and richly endowed; its buildings were of "wondrous cost and greatness,"[11] and were esteemed one of the special ornaments of the city. The bodies of two queens lay buried there. This magnificent pile was entirely destroyed, so that only the walls remained. Knox places it to the credit of the "reformers" that the prior "was permitted to take with him as much gold and silver as he was able to

[6] Knox: "History," p. 143. [7] Ibid. [8] Ibid. [9] Grub: "Ecclesiastical History of Scotland," Vol. II., p. 69. [10] McCrie: "Life of John Knox" (sixth edition), p. 156. [11] Knox: "History," p. 143.

carry."[12] A generous indemnity, truly, for the ruin of his beautiful home! The Dominican and Franciscan convents suffered the same fate as the Charterhouse. The former, a favorite residence of Scottish monarchs, was often referred to as "the Palace." In its church many parliaments and ecclesiastical assemblies had been held, and the decrees of the National Councils of the Scottish Church, deposited there for safe keeping, perished in its downfall. The inmates of these houses are styled by Knox "Black and Gray *Thieves;*"[13] while their despoilers are spoken of as men whose consciences were so "beaten with the Word" that their only thought was "to abolish idolatry, the places and monuments thereof."[14]

The example set by the Protestants of Perth spread to Cupar in Fife, and the people of that place, "by general consent, either broke the images or threw them out of the church, and thus," says the Protestant narrator, "cleansed their temple."[15]

The Queen Regent was naturally deeply incensed by such proceedings, and particularly by the demolition of the Charterhouse, with its royal tombs. She threatened to take extreme measures to punish the ringleaders, and they, on their part, fortified the city against any attack from the royal troops. To the Regent, the loyal lords and the prelates and clergy they despatched letters justifying their conduct. The insolent tone of these epistles, which clearly declared their resolve to take up arms in defense of their cause, judged in the light of after events, indicates the confidence they reposed in the substantial help of England. Particularly insulting was the superscription of the address to the clergy: "To the generation of Antichrist, the pestilent prelates and their shavelings within Scotland, the congregation of Christ Jesus within the same saith——" Protestant historians, such as Bishop Keith and Fraser Tytler, are forced to lament the anti-Christian spirit which pervades this disgraceful letter.

The Regent had prepared to lead an army against the rebels, whose forces had been increased by the arrival of the Earl of Glencairn with about three thousand men, when an arrangement was come to between the opposing parties through the efforts of the Earl of Argyll and Lord James Stuart (afterwards Earl of Moray),[16] both of them deeply implicated in the Protestant cause, though ostensibly on the side of the queen. The reforming party evacuated Perth, and the Regent took possession of the city, and, to Knox's indignation, "began straight to make provision for their

[12] Knox: "History," p. 143. [13] Ibid. [14] Ibid. [15] Buchanan: "History of Scotland," Vol. II., p. 249. [16] Through inadvertence this nobleman was erroneously styled in a previous article Lord James *Murray*. He was raised to the earldom at a later date by Queen Mary.

Mass,"[17] as a public restoration of that Catholic worship which the inhabitants had virtually abolished.

The Protestant side was further strengthened by the defection at this time of the Lord James and the Earl of Argyll, who openly espoused the reformed doctrines and took a leading part henceforth in the proceedings of the Congregation. Emboldened by success, the Protestants repeated in other towns the sacrileges already witnessed at Perth. After Knox had preached at Crail and Anstruther, the mob proceeded to wreck both those churches. After another sermon at St. Andrews, on the casting out of the buyers and sellers from the temple, the Franciscan and Dominican friaries were laid in ruins, and the work of demolition was commenced in the glorious Cathedral by the wholesale destruction of everything holy or beautiful.[18] It was almost immediately after this "reforming" of St. Andrews that the noble Benedictine abbey of Lindores was attacked. In a letter to a female friend, Mrs. Anne Locke, Knox thus refers to the event: "The abbey of Lindores, a place of black monks, distant from St. Andrews twelve miles, we reformed, their altars overthrew we, their idols, vestments of idolatry and Mass books we burnt in their presence, and commanded them to cast away their monkish habits."[19]

The Cistercian monastery of Balmerino shared the same fate. Not even Scone, the historic abbey which had witnessed for centuries the unction and coronation of Scottish sovereigns, was destined to escape the fury of the so-called reformers. The Lords of the Congregation had already informed the Bishop of Moray, its Commendatory Abbot, that his only chance of saving the abbey from destruction lay in joining the Protestant party. Before he could reply to this communication a mob from Dundee and Perth attacked the buildings, and in spite of the attempt of Argyll and Lord James to stay the work of devastation, the noble pile was reduced to a heap of blackened ruins. The churches and monasteries of Stirling and Linlithgow and the abbey of Cambuskenneth were next overthrown, and the mob marched on to Edinburgh, sacking and destroying every church and religious house in the city, even the royal abbey of Holyrood itself, and ending by taking forcible possession of the Mint.

It is worthy of note that by this time Knox had no scruple in identifying himself with the iconoclasts. After complaining that

---

[17] Knox: "History," p. 151. [18] Although contemporary writers do not mention the demolition of the Cathedral at this time, Grub says that it is "a tradition of very general reception" that the destruction commenced then. Hist., Vol. II., p. 71 (note.) [19] McCrie: "Life of Knox," Appendix, No. VII.

the Provost of Edinburgh, Lord Seton, "had taken upon him the protection and defense of the Black and Gray Friars," constraining "the most honest of the town to watch those monsters, to their great grief and trouble," he goes on to relate with evident satisfaction the destruction of their property by the "poor, who had made havoc," he says, "of all such things as were movable in those places before our coming, and left nothing but bare walls; yea, not so much as door or window; whereby we were the lesser troubled in putting order to such places."[20] The extract already given concerning Lindores is another proof of his sympathy with the action of the "rascal multitude," upon whose shoulders some writers have vainly endeavored to shift the whole burden of responsibility. It must, moreover, be borne in mind that the "Beggar's Warning,"[21] which had so accurately prophesied the fate of the religious houses, was not the work of any illiterate person, a fact which implicates some at least of the leaders of the movement in the sacrileges which were the result.

Events in Edinburgh called forth a strong protest from the Queen Regent in the form of a royal proclamation declaring the Congregation and all who favored them to be rebels. The document stated in clear terms that the conduct of the Protestant party gave evidence that not religion or anything connected with it, but rather the desire for the subversion of all authority, was at the root of their actions; this was proved by their constant communication with agents from England, and by the recent seizure of the instruments of coinage. In conclusion, the members of the Congregation were commanded to leave Edinburgh without delay. The reformers answered by a letter to the Regent, in which they declared their single aim to be the glory of God and abolition of idolatry. This communication they followed up by sending two representatives to the queen to explain more fully their desires and hopes. Besides asking for liberty in the practice of their religion, they expressed a wish that the French soldiers who had been taken by the Regent into her service, and who had aroused the deep dislike of all, should be dismissed to their own country. A second proclamation from Mary, declaring that none should be molested who conducted themselves as peaceable and loyal subjects, had the effect of weakening for a time the Protestant party by drawing many to the queen's side.

The mention, by the Regent, of English factions, and, by the Congregation, of French mercenaries, necessitates some few words

[20] Knox: "History," p. 156. [21] A summary of this extraordinary effusion was given in a previous paper; it may be found in the April number of this *Review*, p. 363.

of explanation regarding the part taken by the two countries in Scottish affairs at this period. The Queen of Scots, wedded to the young king, Francis II., and at this time residing in France, was naturally an object of interest to the princes of the house of Guise, her mother's relatives; their efforts were consequently directed to the strengthening of the power of the Scottish queen and her representative, the Queen Regent. To this end they despatched to Scotland several bodies of French soldiers, whose presence was a constant source of chagrin to the reformers. Later on a French bishop was sent to the Regent as legate of Pope Paul IV., and in his train came several distinguished French theologians, whose efforts were directed towards the reconciliation of backsliders from the Faith. The legate took care to establish Catholic rites once more in the collegiate church of St. Giles, Edinburgh, and the labors of his companions were rewarded by the bringing back of many renegades and the strengthening of waverers. Thus it was evident that French support meant the upholding of Catholicity, and this it was that irritated the Protestant party.

Elizabeth of England had kept an anxious eye on Scottish affairs since her accession. She hated Knox for his political opinions, and disliked the Calvinistic principles of the reformers generally. Yet it was her policy to break the power of the Guises, who favored the right of the young Queen of Scots to the throne of England and stigmatized Elizabeth as base-born. The easiest way of striking at them, without breaking peace with France, was through Scotland. This was why, when France became active in helping the Regent, the Queen of England resolved to assist the opposing party.

Knox had already constituted himself political agent in the matter, and his letters may still be seen among the State Papers[22] begging for help against the French in money and men; many of these are written under the assumed name of Sinclair (that of his mother's family), for the reformer evidently recognized the incongruity of a minister of the "true church" persuading intrigue and bloodshed. It was many months before Elizabeth could be induced to enter into any definite agreement with the Congregation. When at length she resolved to act, it was only on condition that there should be no mention in the treaty of anything concerning religion; it was to be purely a political arrangement, intended to rescue Scotland from French interference. Part of the scheme was the deposition of the Regent and the appointment of the Duke of Chatelherault, the head

[22] State Papers, Scotland, Elizabeth, Vol. I.. Nos. 65, 88-90, 97, etc. The reader who is desirous of learning more of the moral character of Knox will find much information thereon in these letters.

of the house of Hamilton, or his son, the Earl of Arran, in her place. Both these men favored the Protestant party, and as they were next heirs, after Queen Mary, to the throne of Scotland, there seemed some hope of changing the succession, and thereby rendering Elizabeth's position secure. The conduct of the leading reformers in this matter is reprehended by even Protestant historians. "This transaction," says one, "presents us with a somewhat mortifying view of the early reformers in this country, when we find that after all the solemn warnings denounced against trusting too exclusively to an arm of flesh, Knox, who then acted as secretary to the council of the congregation in the west, and Balnaves, who filled the same situation in the council established at Glasgow, consented to purchase the coöperation of mere human power by omitting all allusion to that cause of religious reformation which they had so repeatedly represented as the paramount object for which they had taken up arms and were ready to sacrifice their lives."[23]

Elizabeth's policy, says another writer, "was in itself wicked and unjust, and though apparently successful, was fraught with evils which produced results fatal to the happiness and well-being of both kingdoms."[24] If this can be maintained from a Protestant point of view, it becomes still more apparent when regarded in a Catholic light. It is quite certain that but for English help the Reformation would never have been brought about in Scotland. With Elizabeth's powerful aid a revolution was set on foot and maintained until the jealous Queen of England had gained her end in the overthrow of her rival, Mary Stuart. Her consent to join the cause of the Congregation came just when help was most needed. Emboldened by fresh recruits to their ranks, the Protestant party had had the audacity to address a document to the Regent informing her that she was deprived of authority, as she had failed to carry out the wishes of the young queen. This act of rebellion had alienated many of their followers, the French soldiers had proved too strong for them and they had been forced to quit Edinburgh "amid the shouts and insults of a great proportion of the citizens."[25] Without extraneous help their cause would have resulted in complete failure, and the Regent's party would have gained a permanent ascendancy.

The Treaty of Berwick between the Duke of Norfolk, representing England, and Lord James Stuart, on the Scottish side, was signed on February 27, 1560, and a few months later an English army eight thousand strong entered Scotland and a fleet of four-

[23] Fraser Tytler: "History of Scotland," Vol. III., p. 116. [24] Grub: "Ecclesiastical History of Scotland," Vol. II., p. 74. [25] Fraser Tytler: "History of Scotland," Vol. III., p. 114.

teen ships attacked Leith. The Congregation meanwhile resumed their old work of plundering and demolishing sacred edifices. The Abbeys of Paisley, Kilwinning and Dumfermline had already suffered during the previous autumn; now it was the turn of the more northern sanctuaries. Aberdeen was visited by the barons of the Mearns and the Dominican and Carmelite Friaries destroyed. The houses of the Franciscans and Trinitarians were fortunately protected by the zeal and devotion of the citizens from a like fate, and the noble cathedral of St. Machar was saved through the vigorous action of the Earl of Huntly.

While the country was thus a prey to foreign invaders and sacrilegious rebels, the Queen Regent lay down to die. Her health, long failing, had been still more weakened by grief and anxiety at the unhappy state of Scotland. From her sick-bed in Edinburgh Castle she sent an urgent message to the leaders of the Congregation, asking them to visit her. In pathetic words she bemoaned the evils that had fallen upon the country, and besought the nobles to strive earnestly to procure peace and to rally around their young queen. Then, bursting into tears, she asked pardon of all whom she had offended, declaring that she heartily forgave all who had offended her and prayed to God to pardon them. In the judgment of a writer who had no sympathy for the queen's religious opinions, "the pathetic scene of her last farewell to her foes" is "an incident which for Christian meekness has no parallel in history."[26] Those who witnessed it were deeply touched. The queen expired on the following day, June 10, 1560. She had foreseen the difficulties which would be made about her burial as a Catholic sovereign, and had begged to be interred in the Benedictine Abbey of Rheims, of which her sister was abbess. As she had expected, the preachers forbade "the use of any superstitious rites in that realm, which God Himself had begun to purge,"[27] and it was only after several months' delay that the coffin containing her remains was conveyed secretly to France and deposited in the resting-place she had chosen. The death of Mary of Guise aroused, as an old chronicler declares, "the great griefe and lamentation of the whole number of the estates and people of the realme."[28] "This," observes Miss Strickland, in her life of the queen, "could not have been the case if she had been the unfeminine monster described by Knox. But," she continues, "the accusations brought by Knox against this Princess are seldom borne out by facts, while they afford abundant proof of the indomitable

[26] Miss Strickland: "Queens of England," Vol. II., p. 266. [27] M. S. Calderwood (British Museum) vide Fraser Tytler: "History of Scotland," Vol. III., p. 121. [28] Holinshed: "Chronicles," Vol. V., p. 603 (ed. 1808.)

nature of his prejudice, which neither her forgiveness of those who had offended her nor her dying appeal for pardon to those whom she had offended could soften."[29]

The misery produced throughout Scotland by protracted warfare moved all parties to strive for peace, and in less than a month after the Regent's death hostilities were brought to an end by the signing of a treaty at Edinburgh by commissioners sent from France and England. The French representatives had received instructions to ignore the Treaty of Berwick as an act of rebellion, but by the astuteness of Cecil they were won over to concessions which secured the interests of the reformers, without any direct reference to the alliance of the latter with England. Elizabeth still maintained the attitude she had assumed at first, and allowed no reference to be made in the treaty to the religious disputes between the parties. Nevertheless the Protestants gained their end in another way. Among the articles was one relating to the proximate assembling of a Parliament, which should have the same power and validity as though it had been formally summoned by the king and queen. It was upon this clause that they based their hopes of the success of their reform. That they were well satisfied with the treaty is evident from the flattering terms in which they expressed their gratitude to the English queen for the part she had played in the affair. They had good reason for congratulation, for, as Tytler says, the treaty which they had just secured "led to the full establishment of the Reformation," and was "intimately connected with the subsequent course of events."[30]

Now that fortune seemed to smile upon the Congregation and its undertakings, many timid or doubtful proselytes were encouraged to join the ranks of the reformers. Among these were even some of the prelates and several of the clergy. Whether their motives were as pure as Knox would have us believe is open to doubt. It is significant that some of them were rewarded by prominent positions in the Protestant ministry, which now began to be organized with more regular method. Preachers were appointed for the chief towns, Knox himself undertaking the charge of Edinburgh. In his new capacity the arch-reformer presided with his usual anti-Catholic ardor at a solemn service in St. Giles' Church to offer thanks for the Treaty of Edinburgh.

Like all the other clauses of the treaty, that referring to the proposed Parliament was inserted subject to the approval of Francis and Mary, sovereigns of France and Scotland; yet, although their

[29] Strickland: loc. cit. [30] Fraser Tytler: "History of Scotland," Vol. III., p. 124.

sanction had not been given (and it is clear that it never was), the Congregation boldly pushed on their project. So early a date had been fixed for the assembly that there was barely time for the royal assent to reach Scotland beforehand had their majesties been willing to grant it. This was doubtless premeditated, to judge from after events. On August 1 the Parliament met, the number of representatives being unusually large. This was owing to the presence of a large gathering of lesser barons, who had joined the reformers and who claimed the right to sit and vote. This right was not unanimously or immediately accorded;[31] for nearly a century scarcely more than one or two had made use of their privilege, and then only by virtue of a special writ. The treaty provided that all should sit "who are in use to be present;" the expression was held by some to militate against the right of these lesser barons. "It might well be deemed somewhat unusual," says Keith, "for a hundred of them to jump all at once into the Parliament, especially in such a juncture as the present."[32]

But the right of the lesser barons was not the chief question under discussion at the opening of the assembly. Many of the members maintained that until the assent of the sovereigns had been given no Parliament could legally be held, and they urged delay. It was to the interest of the reforming party, however, to carry matters through as rapidly as possible; it would even seem that strategem had been employed, for the French king informed the English ambassador as late as August 9 that he had not yet seen the Treaty of Edinburgh, or even heard from the commissioners.[33] The dispute took eight days to settle, when the majority of votes decided in favor of continuing the sittings.

Although many ecclesiastics were present, a large proportion of them were mere titulary dignitaries, who were notably on the side of reform. It is to be regretted that the true faith should have had so few representatives. Several of the Catholic bishops and abbots and their supporters among the nobility had declined to attend. The Earl of Huntly, the Chancellor and leading Catholic noble, excused himself on the plea of ill-health. In his absence William Maitland, of Lethington, was appointed president. The Lords of the Articles, who had to introduce the various measures, were chosen by the temporal lords from among such prelates as were known to favor the new opinions. The Catholic-minded eccle-

[31] It is noteworthy that Randolph thought well to enclose in a letter to Cecil a copy of the petition of the lesser barons to be allowed their privilege. State Papers, Elizabeth, Vol. V., No. 8. [32] Keith: "Affairs of Church and State," p. 147. [33] French correspondence in State Paper office, quoted by Fraser Tytler: "History," Vol. III., p. 126 (note.)

siastics present protested against a mode of procedure so unfair, but their protest was disregarded.

One of the first proceedings was the presentation of a petition entitled: "The Barons, Gentlemen, Burgesses and other true subjects of this realm, professing the Lord Jesus within the same, to the nobility and states of parliament presently assembled within the said realm, desire grace, mercy and peace from God the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, with the increase of His Holy Spirit."[34] The document went on to recount the ardent desires of the petitioners for "a godly reformation of abuses," especially with regard to the doctrines of the Roman Church, which were asserted to contain "many pestiferous errors." The petitioners craved the abolition of idolatry, the reformation of the clergy, the renunciation of the "usurped authority" of "that Man of Sin (who) falsely claimeth to himself the titles of 'The Vicar of Christ, the successor of Peter, the head of the Church, that he cannot err, that all power is granted unto him,'" etc.,[35] with much more to the same effect—the whole being couched in such violent and intemperate language that a Protestant historian declares that it is "difficult to read (it) without emotions of sorrow and pity."[36]

The petitioners were asked to lay before Parliament a summary of the precise doctrines they desired to establish, and four days later —so well prepared were they—a document was presented entitled: "The Confession of the Faith professed and believed by the Protestants within the Realm of Scotland."[37] The Lords of the Articles, according to custom, first examined and approved of it, and on the 17th of August it was read before the whole assembly, previous to submitting it to the votes. There was very little discussion upon the subject; the majority of the members present were heart and soul with the movement, and the small Catholic minority kept persistent silence.

It must be noticed here that in this procedure the reformers were again flagrantly violating the terms of the Treaty of Edinburgh. The last article of that treaty distinctly affirmed that the question of religious changes was to be discussed by specially chosen commissioners, and their decisions were to be submitted for approval to the king and queen. Yet not only had the leaders of the Congregation hurried on the Parliament without waiting for the royal assent, but the very men who, by their management of the commissioners from France, had fraudulently averted their own condemna-

[34] Knox: "History," p. 219. [35] Knox: "History," p. 220. [36] Fraser Tytler: "History," Vol. III., p. 128. [37] Knox: loc. cit.

tion as rebels, actually dared to pose as lawgivers to the whole realm, and that in a matter so sacred as the worship of God.

The silence of the Catholic prelates, which he attributes to anxiety as to their temporal possessions, is severely censured by one historian. "They were probably right," says Grub, "in attending Parliament, notwithstanding the doubts as to its lawfulness, but, being there, they were bound to defend to the utmost the faith which they professed and the institution which it was their solemn duty to maintain. It might not be easy for them to determine what precise line of conduct they should adopt, but under no circumstances could their silence be justified. It encouraged their enemies and entirely disheartened their friends among the laity."[38]

There is, however, another view of the case. It is clear from documents afterwards found among the archives of the Scots College in Paris that the bishops had from the first relied upon the settlement of the religious question by a properly constituted Parliament, assembled by royal authority. When this hope was frustrated by the hasty convocation of the Parliament of August 1, without sanction from the crown, and the "Confession of Faith" was brought forward to receive its assent, they seemed to have considered it more prudent and dignified to hold their peace. They probably hardly realized the serious nature of the crisis, and felt little doubt that all would be put right again when the sovereigns had been acquainted with what had been done. Archbishop Hamilton, in one of the documents referred to, thus expresses himself on the subject: "I neither can nor will think that our sovereign will let all this country be oppressed wrongously by subjects; but I will not judge till I see the uttermost."[39] In the same letter, addressed to the Archbishop of Glasgow, who was then in Paris, he gives his reason for writing, as follows: "I must make this little billet to your lordship more that remembrance be not lost between us *than for any matters of importance.*"[40] The words in Italics are worthy of note, as the letter is dated on the very day after the "Confession" had been accepted by the Protestant majority in Parliament.

To us who look at the event in the light of subsequent history, the adoption of the "Confession" is the destruction of the Catholic Faith and the setting up of Protestantism in its place by the highest authorities then in power. It had less significance to contemporaries, for Bishop Lesley, in his history, has thought it unworthy of notice. There seems no difficulty, therefore, in supposing that the bishops were actuated by similar motives in keeping silence at the discussion.

[38] Grub: "Ecclesiastical History of Scotland," Vol. II., p. 85. [39] Keith: "Affairs of Church and State," pp. 485-88. [40] Ibid.

But though they made no protest as to the matter comprising the "Confession," they were forced to a decision when it was a question of voting for or against it as the standard of faith for the realm. And here also we may detect the same attitude of aloofness. The Primate and the Bishops of Dunkeld and Dunblane stated their willingness to reform abuses, but considered that study and deliberation were necessary before the passing of so sweeping a measure as that in question. In spite of the sarcastic invitation of the Earl Marischal calling upon them to refute the doctrines if they could, the prelates maintained the position they had taken up. They alone, with the Abbot of Kilwinning, as representatives of the spiritual lords, and the Earls of Cassillis, Caithness and Athole, and Lords Somerville and Borthwick among the temporal lords, voted against the measure. The new profession of faith was accordingly accepted in Parliament by an overwhelming majority.

Although the new doctrines were thus established by law, as far as Parliament could do so, further means were necessary to complete the work begun. Accordingly, on the 24th of August, three more Acts were passed. The first abolished for ever the authority and jurisdiction of the Pope within the realm of Scotland; the second repealed all former acts contrary to God's Word and the Confession of Faith lately established; the third ordained that no one in future should be permitted to administer the Sacraments without a special license, and threatened all who should say or hear Mass with confiscation of their goods for the first offense, banishment for the second and death for the third.

The crowning work of this unauthorized assembly was a final violation of the very Treaty of Edinburgh to which it owed its existence. In accordance with the terms of the treaty, several prelates applied for the restoration of property which had been lost during the war. Their petitions were ignored till the very last day of the session, when they were set aside on the plea that no one appeared in support of them. The Parliament further enacted that all leases of Church lands granted since March 6, 1558, by the Archbishops of St. Andrews and Glasgow, the Bishops of Murray, Dunkeld and Dunblane, the Abbots of Dunfermline and Crossraguel, the Priors of Whithern and Pluscardyn and other opponents of the Congregation, should be null and void.

Now that the articles of faith professed by the reformers had been imposed upon the country, the next duty was to legislate for the discipline to be followed in the practice of the new form of religion. Accordingly certain persons were deputed to draw up the "Book

of Discipline;" amongst them were Knox and Winram, the apostate sub-prior of St. Andrews; the latter is thought to have taken an important part in the compilation of the Catholic catechism known as Archbishop Hamilton's some eight years earlier. The Book of Discipline was submitted to a convention of the nobility at Edinburgh in January, 1561. It was by no means unanimously welcomed. "Some," says Knox, "approved of it, and willed the same to have been set forth by a law; others . . . grudged, insomuch that the name of the book of discipline became odious unto them. . . . The cause we have before declared; some were licentious, some had greedily gripped the possessions of the Church, and others thought that they would not lack their part of Christ's coat."[41] Although the Book was not formally sanctioned by the convention, yet many of the leaders subscribed their names to it, adding a proviso that all prelates and beneficed persons who had joined the Congregation should enjoy their ecclesiastical revenues for their lifetime. It is needless to say that as the "Confession" had swept away every vestige of the old Catholic faith, so the Book of Discipline entirely overthrew Catholic ritual and practice—putting an end to all feast days, even the festival of Easter, and retaining Sunday alone as a day of religious worship and abolishing five of the seven Sacraments.

The Congregation took care that the new laws should not remain a dead letter. In December, 1560, the ministers and commissioners of the reformed religion met at Edinburgh. In one of their assemblies it was decided to petition Parliament to punish as idolaters certain persons who still persisted in celebrating or hearing Mass. Among the offenders were the Earls of Eglinton and Cassillis, the Abbot of Crossraguel and the Prior of Whithern. It was stated that Mass continued to be openly said in the churches of Maybole, Girvan, Kirk-Oswald and Dailly—all in Ayrshire. In May of the following year another Assembly of the reformers met at Edinburgh. The members drew up a complaint to the privy council with regard to the suppression of idolatry—their usual term for the Mass—and all its monuments, mentioning also some other grievances. The Lords of the Council, Knox tells us, agreed to their requests, and the result of this promise was soon seen. The Parliament, which reassembled in the same month, passed an act for demolishing all remaining abbeys and monasteries. The work was entrusted to Lord James Stuart, titular Prior of St. Andrews, and to the Earls of Arran, Argyll and Glencairn. The beautiful Abbey of Paisley met its fate at this time; the Primate, who was its Commendator,

[41] Knox: "History," p. 232

barely escaped with his life. Kilwinning, Crossraguel and other houses were also destroyed, and every church in the kingdom speedily became the scene of devastation and sacrilege. Bells, holy vessels, books, vestments were wantonly carried off, and such as were valueless to the spoilers ruthlessly destroyed.

The youthful Francis II., the husband of Mary Queen of Scots, died on the 6th of December, 1560. The ties that bound Mary to France being thus severed, her return to her native land began to be proposed. The Prior of the Knights of St. John, who had been despatched to France to give an account of the transactions following the Treaty of Edinburgh, and who arrived about September, had been received with courtesy by Francis and Mary, but they had refused to ratify the treaty, and the Cardinal of Lorraine at the same time had spoken in plain terms of disapprobation to the English ambassador regarding Elizabeth's share in the matter.

Now, however, it was felt by the Catholic party that the queen's return to Scotland would have the effect of drawing many to her allegiance who had objected to French supremacy under the rule of her mother. In February, 1561, therefore, commissioners arrived from France with a message from the young queen, announcing her speedy return and empowering the Duke of Chatelherault and others to assemble a Parliament.

The two parties in the state now vied with each other in being the first to offer to their sovereign the profession of their devoted service. John Lesley, Official of Aberdeen, afterwards Bishop of Ross and Mary's faithful adherent, was sent to France by the Earls of Huntly, Sutherland, Crawford and Athole and the other Catholic leaders and prelates, on a mission to the queen. The Lord James, as the representative of the Protestant party, was requested to present to her the allegiance of the Congregation. Lesley arrived first and was granted an interview. On the part of the Catholic lords he warned the queen against her half-brother, Lord James, who was even then at the court of Elizabeth, and advised her to take care that he should be detained in France until her own safe arrival in Scotland. He begged Mary to effect her landing at Aberdeen, where her faithful Catholic subjects would provide her with an army twenty thousand strong to escort her to the capital. Mary, however, mistrusted Huntly, and was, moreover, desirous of offending no party; so, though kind and gracious to Lesley, she did not accept his proposals.

Lord James Stuart arrived next day. He was received by the

young queen with much affection. His urgent request that she should confirm the Treaty of Edinburgh was, however, firmly refused. There is good reason to suspect that Elizabeth had prompted him in this measure, for Lord James made known the result of his interview without delay to the English ambassador, who sent on the news to the English queen, and the State Papers give evidence of Elizabeth's indignation at the refusal of Mary to ratify the treaty.[42] Mary embarked at Calais on the 14th of August, 1561, and successfully avoided the English cruisers sent out by Elizabeth to intercept her, arriving at Leith six days later.

A warm welcome awaited her from the people, who flocked to Holyrood Palace in crowds to testify their loyalty. Their attitude towards their Catholic queen tended to foster the belief which Mary had always entertained, that her presence would do much to set religious troubles at rest, and that in course of time the Catholic Church would regain her sway over Scotland. But events proved the contrary. On the first Sunday after her arrival she prepared to assist at Mass in her private chapel, together with her Catholic attendants. When the news spread abroad a furious mob, led by one of the reformers, the Master of Lindsay, invaded the court of the palace and threatened death to the "idolatrous priest." It was only by the presence and authority of Lord James, who personally guarded the celebrant till the service was over, that violence was prevented.

The queen's resolution to maintain for her own household the benefit of Catholic rites was a sore point with the reformers. Some of the nobles maintained her right to the practice of her religion, but Knox and the ministers were furious. Yet, although the latter party asked advice of Calvin himself, no measures were taken at that period to disturb the queen in her religious practices. Knox's fiery zeal found vent in vehement sermons against idolatry. Mary, with undaunted courage, summoned the reformer to her presence, and more than once granted him a long interview, when religious questions were discussed between them. No permanent benefit resulted, and Knox continued to the end to cherish with regard to the queen the feelings of the bitterest animosity.

It soon became evident that the Congregation was too strong to be easily put down. Mary, with all her good will, never succeeded in obtaining more than toleration for herself and her attendants, and the time came when even this was denied her—when the Chapel Royal at Holyrood was stripped of its altars and images and an

[42] State Papers, Scotland, Eliz., Vol. VI., Nos. 51, 57.

imprisoned queen, deserted by her Catholic household, was forbidden the services of even a confessor.

The queen's position from the first was one of extraordinary difficulty and danger. Elizabeth of England, her jealous rival, was always watching for an opportunity to deprive Mary of her crown and prevent the succession of a Catholic dynasty in either kingdom; her spies were all on the alert to gain any advantage for their mistress. Mary herself, only nineteen years of age and unaccustomed to rule, stood in need of reliable councillors. By her side, prompting all her actions, was her wily half-brother, pretending to watch her interests with affectionate solicitude; yet all the while he was her greatest and most powerful adversary. Ranged against her openly were the majority of the nobles, seeking to bring her round to their supposed religious convictions in order to maintain their unjustly gotten gains. A feeble minority only were really loyal, and among these the Earl of Huntly and his house were alienated through the machinations of Lord James Stuart.

Mary's fall was due entirely to the ambition of this unworthy relative, who was in the pay of Elizabeth all along. He had power and influence enough in the beginning to have made the queen's authority felt; but his own aggrandizement was paramount. His scheming tended all along to gain the kingly power for himself at the expense of his half-sister's liberty or even life, if need be. History shows this clearly. As early at 1559 a secret mission was despatched from Paris to Scotland to investigate his motives, for the Queen Regent feared even then that he was aiming at the crown. In 1560 Cecil was able to write of him to Elizabeth that he was "not unlike to be a king soon."[43] When the time arrived for Mary's return to Scotland, he made a point of visiting Elizabeth on his way, and when at her court, as Fr. Stevenson points out, "he told her privately, as we learn from Camden, that if she had any regard either for the interests of religion or her own safety, she ought to intercept his sister during her homeward voyage."[44] It was neither his fault nor Elizabeth's, as we know, that the attempt was unsuccessful, and that Mary was not prevented from ever setting her foot on Scottish soil again. When the queen was in the hands of her rebellious subjects, Stuart, who had become through his successful scheming Earl of Moray, threw off all disguise and openly proclaimed that he was heir to the throne, for he could prove that he had been born in wedlock. When at last he had become Regent—a post which he had coveted even before Mary's return from France and had unsuccess-

[43] State Papers, Elizabeth, Scot., Vol. IV., No. 17. [44] Stevenson: "Mary Stuart," p. 236.

fully solicited from her—he led the army which was the means of her utter defeat and subsequent cruel fate.

It is not to be wondered at that, under such circumstances, Mary Stuart should have failed to carry out the darling wish of her heart and restore the true faith to Scotland. The murder of Riccio, of which Moray was the instigator, had more than one motive. Jealousy at the secretary's influence with the queen was one; but another and more powerful reason was the intercourse which, through Riccio's means, Mary was able to keep up with continental courts, and thus keep in touch with Catholic affairs; this led to the fear of Catholic interference and even the restoration of religion. In connection with this subject Knox informs us that after Riccio's death twelve wooden altars were "found ready in the chapel of the Palace of Holyrood house which should have been erected in St. Giles' Church."[45] This is a proof that Mary was always ready and anxious to do her duty as a loyal daughter of the Church to bring back to her realm the blessings of religion, and that Riccio was anxious to help her.

The Sovereign Pontiff, Pius IV., recognized and appreciated this disposition of the queen's. He had sent her the Golden Rose in 1560, soon after her widowhood. He urged her to send an ambassador from Scotland to the Council of Trent in 1562, but such an act would have cost her the crown and perhaps even her life, and she was quite unable to comply. Her letter stating this was read to the assembled fathers, and was received with expressions of the greatest admiration of her staunch Catholic spirit. In the same year, 1562, the Pope sent to Mary a trusty Nuncio, Fr. Nicholas Floris,[46] a Jesuit, to confirm her, if necessary, in her attachment to the Church and assist her with his advice; he was the bearer of a letter from the Pope to Mary. The few bishops who remained faithful to the Church feared to hold intercourse with the Nuncio, and only the Primate dared to receive him into his house, and that on condition that he was disguised.

The Nuncio's report to the General of the Jesuits of the state of Scotland at the time gives a terrible picture of the misery into which the realm had been plunged by the reformers. Some of the monasteries had been utterly destroyed, others were in ruins, churches, altars and sanctuaries were profaned. No religious rite was allowed to be performed, no Sacraments were publicly administered with Catholic ceremonial, no Mass could be publicly said except in the queen's private chapel. Many of the clergy had abjured the faith

[45] Knox: "History," p. 330. [46] He is often spoken of as Goudanus; he was a native of Gouda, in Holland.

and married. The Protestant ministers, if not apostate priests or monks, were ignorant laymen of low rank, whose preaching consisted of the blasphemous denunciation of the Mass and virulent declamation against the Pope. The queen possessed her title only, but no power; scarcely twenty years old, destitute of all human counsel and support, she could do nothing for religion or for the country, as the chief offices of the state were in the hands of Protestants and the few Catholic nobles were kept away from court by the tyranny and violence of the former. The few faithful bishops for the most part were lacking in the qualities necessary for defense against the enemy, the Catholic preachers had neither courage nor ability for discussion with the heretics, such religious as were living were in strict hiding and secular priests did not dare to appear in ecclesiastical dress.[47]

The reference to Catholic controversialists in this report would have been somewhat unfair had it been made a year later. An able and energetic champion of the faith, Ninian Winzet, who had been deprived of his mastership of the grammar school of Linlithgow because he refused to conform to Protestantism, was already beginning to trouble the reformers by his skill in discussion. The numerous controversial treatises which he wrote later on have never been successfully refuted by Protestants, and they won for their author at the time the reward of exile for the faith—his opponents having recourse to violence when argument failed them. Winzet barely escaped their attack and fled to the continent. He became a priest, and eventually Abbot of the Scottish Abbey of Ratisbon.

Another courageous disputant was Abbot Quintin Kennedy, Benedictine Abbot of Crossraguel, who wrote and spoke with boldness and ability in favor of Catholic doctrines, and stirred up much bitterness of feeling in his regard amongst the Protestants. He was, however, at an advanced age when he stood forth as champion of the Catholic cause, and died in 1564. "Had all the Scottish prelates," remarks Grub, "possessed the learning and the virtues of the last consecrated Abbot of Crossraguel, the reformation of the Church might have been effected in a very different manner."[48]

From the report of Goudanus as to the state of Scotland at the time he visited the country, it is evident that there was little, if any, hope of the revival of Catholicity among the people as a nation. The toleration which had been shown to the queen was not destined to last. Her unworthy husband, Lord Darnley, a Catholic in name merely, was too weak to be any support to her, and became

[47] *Vide* Forbes-Leith : "Narratives of Scottish Catholics," pp. 72-74. [48] Grub : "Ecclesiastica History of Scotland," Vol. II., p. 127.

eventually the tool of her enemies. When her only child was born his baptism was deferred for some months, owing to the opposition of the Congregation to the use of the Catholic rite. It was the last time, indeed, when it was eventually administered, that the public and solemn ceremonial of the Church was seen in Scotland.

Moray and his associates brought their schemes to a climax at last, in the imprisonment of the queen, after Darnley had been removed by a violent death; henceforth Mary and the infant prince were completely in the power of the reformers. After more than one attempt to destroy her by poison,[49] the queen was forced, by the threat of instant death should she refuse, to sign her abdication. The effort she made to free herself from her adversaries by the help of the small party of her supporters met with a disastrous defeat at Langside in 1568, and led to her long captivity under Elizabeth, and her tragic end upon the scaffold.

Archbishop Hamilton, the last Catholic Primate, had long been the object of the reformers' special hatred on account of his staunch adherence to the old religion. At Easter, 1563, he, together with several others of the clergy, had suffered imprisonment for celebrating Mass and hearing confessions. After regaining his liberty he became one of the leading supporters of Queen Mary, and it was he who baptized the infant Prince James in 1566. After the forced abdication of the queen, the Archbishop was seized by his enemies, hurried through the mockery of a trial, and hanged at Stirling, dressed in his pontifical vestments. He had been accused of complicity in the assassination of the Regent Moray; but the only crime proved against him, as he himself asserted, was his fidelity to God and the queen. He met his fate on April 5, 1571.

Knox, that "Father of the Scottish Reformation," before his death, in 1572, was able to glory in the fact that the last Catholic sovereign and the last Catholic Archbishop of St. Andrews had been moved out of the path of what he was pleased to designate so frequently "the true Church of God." Henceforth the completion of the Reformation was but the work of time.

Enough has been said to show that the real nature of the movement known as the Scottish Reformation was political rather than religious. It remains for another article to trace out the part taken therein by the nation at large; as hitherto our attention has been mainly directed to the attitude of the clergy and the higher orders in Scotland towards the overthrow of the Catholic Church.

Dom Michael Barrett, O. S. B.

Fort Augustus, Scotland.

[49] *Vide* Nau: "Memorials of the Reign of Mary Stewart," edited by Stevenson, pp. 55, 63, etc

Scientific Chronicle.

ATLAS OF VARIABLE STARS.

On the occasion of the dedication of the Yerkes Observatory of the University of Chicago, Rev. J. G. Hagen, S. J., the director of the Georgetown College Observatory, announced in a speech immediately preceding the dedication ceremonies that through the kindness of Miss Catherine Wolfe Bruce he was able to publish his atlas of variable stars, on which he had been working for seven years. The publisher, F. L. Dames, Berlin, estimated that the deficit in the printing expenses, after the possible sale of such a work had been taken into account, would be $1,750. This amount had to be met before the work could appear. Through the kind mediation of Professor E. C. Pickering, director of the Harvard College Observatory, Miss Bruce gave the required sum and the atlas went to press. At the same meeting at which Father Hagen made the announcement of Miss Bruce's generous donation, Professor Pickering took occasion to say that his appreciation of the "Atlas of Variable Stars" was best shown by the action he had taken in its behalf, and the appreciation of Miss Bruce of the same was as well shown by her generous gift. He concluded by remarking that when the atlas came out astronomers would wonder how they had got along without it.

A short description of the purpose and scope of the atlas may be welcome to our readers. The purpose of the work is to assist in the determination of the fluctuations in brightness of those stars whose brightness is not constant. This determination is carried out practically by comparing the variable star with stars of constant brightness which are brighter and fainter than the variable in its successive stages. The determination can be made most accurately when these stars of constant brightness, or comparison-stars, do not differ much from the variable, and hence when the range of brightness of the variable is considerable several comparison-stars must be employed and their relative brightness *inter se* must be determined. When the variable has been thus observed many times from brightest to faintest and back again to brightest, the observer is able to determine the range of brightness, the period or length of time within which the variation takes place and the peculiarities of the variation.

To employ his time best the observer should be able to pick out quickly and with certainty from the stars seen that one on which his attention is to be fixed and the stars with which it is to be compared

or with which it has been compared in former observations. Hence the atlas consists of charts of the sky in the neighborhood of each variable, on which the variable is so indicated as to be easily identified in the sky by comparing it with the chart and which contain a sufficient number of stars whose position and brightness are such as to make them serviceable as comparison-stars. Each chart is accompanied by a catalogue of all the stars on it and their relative brightnesses from Father Hagen's observations.

The atlas will contain only the known variable stars. While the discovery of new variables is always welcome, yet the thorough study of those already known is of more importance. When a greater amount of knowledge has been gained we shall be able to formulate theories as to the causes of the variation of light in the different classes of variables as has already been done for one type. There is no branch of astronomy in which the amateur, with moderate instrumental equipment, can so easily produce results of scientific value as in the observation of variables, provided his efforts are not mere desultory star-gazing, but are carried on with a certain degree of regularity and persistence.

The whole work is divided into five series, of which the first three are devoted to those variable stars which at their faintest are below the tenth magnitude and hence invisible in a telescope of three inches aperture, the fourth to those stars whose variations can be followed by the use of a three-inch telescope, and the fifth to those for which the naked eye or an opera glass suffices. The first series, which deals with variables below the tenth magnitude, at minimum and lying between the declinations 0 and —25 degrees, appeared in March of last year. The series contained forty-four charts and their accompanying catalogues, with all the explanations necessary for the thorough understanding of the charts and catalogues. Shortly after the appearance of the first series it was evident that the proceeds from the subscription list, even together with Miss Bruce's contribution, would fail to cover the cost of the work. Then it was that Miss Bruce added to her first gift the sum of $1,400.

The second series is now out and the appreciation shown for the first is repeated with even greater emphasis on the appearance of the second. On the publication of the second series Miss Bruce sent $630 through Professor Pickering, of Harvard, to the publisher to pay for the expense of printing. In announcing this fact Professor Pickering writes to Father Hagen: "I congratulate you upon the good progress you are making in your excellent work. We are going to use your charts for selection of standards for faint stellar magnitude in a work of coöperation in which it is expected that the

Yerkes 40-inch, the Virginia 26-inch, the Princeton 23-inch and the Harvard 15-inch telescopes will take part."

Professor C. A. Young, of Princeton, writes: "Your atlas seems to me to be one of the most important and well finished pieces of astronomical work that has ever been done in that line." At the reception of the New York Academy of Sciences in April Professor J. K. Rees, director of the Observatory of Columbia University, New York, took great pleasure in exhibiting the second volume of the atlas. A British officer, Colonel E. E. Marckwick, of the Ordnance Department, writes: "You must allow me to congratulate you on the excellence of the maps you have published of the vicinities of variable stars. They are indeed beautiful—nay, more, exquisite. . . . I have lately taken up the work of the post of director of the variable star section of the British Astronomical Association, and such maps at present would be of the greatest use. Failing such I have had to prepare charts of the vicinity of each variable on our working list for the guidance of those amateurs who are working in this direction. I thus know what a deal of labor is involved in settling which shall be the comparison stars, and then deciding on their magnitudes."

Dr. Ernest Hartwig, director of the Observatory at Bamberg, who is acknowledged as the leading European authority on variable stars, writes in the *Vierteljahrsschrift der Astronomischen Gesellschaft:* "As the Bonn star-charts in their day removed at once the difficulties of finding one's way among the telescopic stars when observing comets, planets and the like, difficulties which the younger generation can scarcely understand, so likewise do these charts, with one stroke, sweep away the great difficulty hitherto existing, for even experienced observers in the identification of and the determination of the variation of the light of the variable. Many who no doubt would gladly devote their time to the observation of variable stars, an occupation yielding no less pleasure than profit, will be prevented from acquiring this beautiful work on account of its high price. The price is high, not for single charts, but on account of the great number of charts in the work. The work, however, will, perhaps slowly at first, become without doubt, in the course of time, an indispensable constituent of the library of every astronomical observatory, just as has happened in the case of the Bonn charts."

This is great praise, coming as it does from such an authority, and will no doubt be appreciated by our readers, who perhaps may not have heard of such a work going forth from one of our American Catholic colleges. That the publication is so far advanced at the present time is, no doubt, due to the kind interest of Professor

Pickering and to the generous support of Miss Bruce. This should be an object lesson to many of our wealthy Catholics who could be of assistance to many investigators in our Catholic colleges throughout the country and enable them to bring to light much that would contribute to the advancement of science and reflect credit on our colleges.

We regret to announce the death of Miss Bruce, who has been such a generous patron of science in this country.

THE TOTAL SOLAR ECLIPSE OF MAY 28, 1900.

This eclipse, of which we spoke in our last Chronicle, is now a matter of history. The scientific results obtained are not collated, discussed and prepared for publication, but some general observations on the character of the eclipse will be of interest to the many who had an opportunity of viewing it only in its partial phases.

From all the reports received from the different stations along the path of totality the weather was most favorable. Although the work at these different stations was distributed so as to include observations on the corona, the prominences, the shadow bands, a search for intramercurial planets, comets and the like, still the great object of interest was the corona. This was a magnificent sight. So long as any of the sun's disc remained uncovered the characteristic effects of the total eclipse were wanting. But in a fraction of a second, so quickly that one was hardly prepared for it, the last direct ray from the sun was quenched by the black disc of the moon and immediately a great pearly halo sprang forth around this black disc and streamed away in moving pendants. This was the corona. This was visible as long as we were within the base of the great cone of darkness which followed the moon in its transit across the face of the sun. On all sides the horizon gleamed with a rim of brilliant light. This was from the air and land which outside the great round shadow was exposed to the light of the sun. In general character the corona during this eclipse resembled the corona as observed in the eclipses of 1878 and 1889. Both of these years as well as the present year were years of minimum sun spots. These facts seem to show a close connection between the sun spots and the corona.

While at almost all the stations a sharp lookout was kept for the shadow bands, still the reports are not all as favorable as one would wish. This is due probably to the fact that the bands were not as

distinct as at previous eclipses. Instead of being pronounced parallel bands of shadow and brightness they appeared more like the reflection of rippled water projected upon a screen. At Barnesville, Ga., Dr. Aiken, of Savannah, devised an ingenious way of photographing the shadow bands. As yet nothing has been heard of the success attending this experiment. If successful, Dr. Aiken will be the first to succeed in this delicate work.

The spectroscopic and photographic work, judging from what has been given out in the daily papers, has been most successful and has revealed some new facts. From a report in the *Baltimore Sun* of the results obtained by the Johns Hopkins observers we learn that the spectrum obtained at Pinehurst, N. C., shows four strong ultra-violet coronal lines which have never been seen before. It was also shown, from the polariscope work of the same party, that the light from the corona was polarized or sunlight reflected, perhaps from meteoric matter; the light from the prominences, however, is their own and not reflected light. Another important report comes from Professor George E. Hale, who was at Wadesboro, N. C. He writes that he obtained for the first time evidences of heat from the corona.

The writer formed one of a party that went to Virginia Beach, Va., to observe the eclipse. The party was under the direction of Rev. John Hagen, S. J., director of the Georgetown College Observatory, and Rev. John Hedrick, professor of astronomy at Woodstock College. Rev. Joseph Algué, S. J., director of the Manila Observatory, was in the party. There were besides Rev. G. Zwack, S. J., of the Georgetown Observatory, and Professor George Coyle, S. J., of Woodstock. As the observations were not in the specific line of work of the observatories represented, there was no elaborate preparation for observation. The observers were, however, thoroughly repaid by the observations made.

Similar satisfactory reports come from other observers, and considering the favorable conditions under which the eclipse was viewed we may expect a decided advance in our knowledge of the sun when the results will have been carefully studied and published.

THE LEVEL OF LAKE NICARAGUA.

In our last Chronicle we referred to the assumed change in the level of Lake Nicaragua. The arguments for such a change were put forward by Professor Angelo Heilprin in the *Scientific American*. Such a statement could not, of course, go unchallenged by the

friends of the Nicaragua Canal project. In the *National Geographic Magazine* Mr. C. Willard Hayes replies to Professor Heilprin.

In rebuttal Mr. Hayes tries to demonstrate on physiographic grounds that the assumed abasement of level could not have taken place. He assigns three causes which singly or in combination might bring about a change in the altitude of the lake: 1. A depression of the whole of this portion of the isthmus without warping. 2. A depression of the lake basin by warping, the sea margins remaining constant. 3. A cutting down of the lake outlet.

The first supposition is easily disposed of by the known stability of the coast line on both the Atlantic and the Pacific sides. "A depression of 20 feet of any occupied portion of the coast could not possibly escape notice." This is admitted by all.

"As there is everywhere a nice adjustment of shore features to present conditions," and no evidence of drowned shores or raised ancient beaches, Mr. Hayes dismisses the second hypothesis. Moreover, such a subsidence, according to Mr. Hayes, would have reached the coast, which is only twelve miles away.

The third supposition Mr. Hayes thinks is removed from the region of possibility from the fact that the San Juan river "meanders through an alluvial plain just covered by the streams when in flood;" that is having the character of "a growing flood-plain," it represents a former extension of the lake silted up by tributary streams, and proves conclusively that the present relations have held for a considerable time.

The disposition of the first supposition we have already referred to. As to the second supposition, Mr. Hayes relies on the presence of drowned shores and raised beaches to prove its falsity, but every geologist knows that the negative testimony of their absence is most illusory. In other words, their absence proves nothing. With regard to the third supposition, namely, that the lake bottom became an exposed alluvial plain, it must be said that this could happen in three ways: either by silting up or by the lowering of the lake, or by the shrinkage of the waters. Mr. Hayes seems to take the first way without advancing any proof for it.

In the *Scientific American* supplement for May 19 Professor Heilprin replies to the article of Mr. Hayes and brings forward a new set of arguments, based on the rainfall, evaporation and outflow of the lake, furnished in the report of the Walker Commission of 1897-99, showing that there has been a shrinkage during the last twenty years.

In the discussion of the subject so far the evidence seems to be so strongly in favor of the theory of the shrinkage of the lake that

it is still a serious objection to the acceptance of the Nicaraguan route for an inter-oceanic canal.

A NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS.

Although our office of Standard Weights and Measures, with its inadequate facilities and meager appropriation, has done excellent work, still it could not compete with similar offices in foreign countries. This is unfortunate, seeing that the United States does more than any other nation to develop the resources of the country and to advance science. The annual appropriation in this country for these purposes amounts to $8,000,000. Hence it is that our Department of Agriculture, our Geological Survey and the like surpass anything of the kind in European countries. Little, however, has been done for physics and chemistry as applied to the arts. The portion of this large appropriation going to the office of Standard Weights and Measures was $10,400. In Germany there is a national physical laboratory conducted at an annual expense of $80,000, while the German Bureau of Weights and Measures receives annually $36,000. For like purposes Great Britain spends every year $62,000; Austria, $46,000, and Russia, $17,500.

The increased application of physics and chemistry to the arts and manufacture necessitates the existence of accurate standards imposed by some authoritative method of verification acceptable to all users of said measurement. If such a source of verification does not exist it soon ceases to be a standard. This fact has urged upon the Secretary of the Treasury the importance of enlarging the scope of the present office of Standard Weights and Measures. For this purpose an amendment was added to the sundry civil bills providing for an office to be known as the National Standardizing Bureau. The functions of this bureau, as declared in the amendment, are as follows: It will have the custody of the Government standards, and the office of comparing the standards used in scientific investigations, engineering, manufacturing, commercial and educational institutions with those adopted by the Government; the construction, when necessary, of standards or their multiples and sub-divisions; the testing and calibration of standard measuring apparatus; the settlement of discussions which arise about standards; and, finally, the determination of physical constants and the properties of materials when such data are important for scientific or manufacturing interests and cannot be obtained elsewhere.

Such a bureau will be of great help to both the scientific and industrial interests of the country, and we hope soon to see it in full operation with all the facilities asked for it by the Secretary of the Treasury.

A SUBSTITUTE FOR CELLULOID.

The action of sulphuric acid on paper, or paper pulp, has long been known. The sulphuric acid acting on the cellulose changes it into amyloid. The amyloid with an excess of water gives a gelatinous precipitate that serves to unite the fibers and forms a transparent sheet resembling parchment. This new formation has not, however, the suppleness of genuine parchment.

On this same principle the new substitute for celluloid is made.

To prepare this new substitute, called *cellulithe*, an exclusively mechanical process is principally employed. Paper pulp is beaten for an extremely long time, anywhere between 40 and 150 hours, depending on the nature of the material used and the speed of rotation of the cylinder that does the work. When a homogeneous liquid, resembling mucilage, from which every trace of fiber has disappeared, is obtained, the process of beating is stopped. To this liquid the name of "milk of cellulose" has been given.

If a colored compound is desired, coloring matter is added at this stage of the process. On account of the beating, the milk of cellulose contains a quantity of air, which is now driven off by boiling. The process of boiling and filtering takes about two hours. The filtered material is received in a perforated vessel and the water which it still contains is either evaporated slowly in the open air or driven off rapidly in an oven, heated to about 40 degrees C. The mixture settles down into a paste which slowly becomes as hard as horn and like it in appearance. Like horn also, this compound can be worked in all desired shapes and can be used for all the numerous purposes for which celluloid is used to-day. It, moreover, is free from the objectionable feature of celluloid, namely, its ready inflammability. This new compound will evidently find a large sphere of usefulness, for, judging from the cheapness of the material from which it is made and the simplicity of the process of manufacture, it can be produced at a very reasonable price.

LOCATING AN OBSTRUCTION.

Many of our readers are familiar with the fact that the mail in several of our large cities is distributed from the central post office

to the branch offices by means of small cylindrical carriers about six inches in diameter propelled through cast-iron pipes by means of air pressure. Occasionally the carrier is caught in the tube, and it is a nice problem to determine the position of the carrier so as to avoid the tearing up of too much of the street.

Such an accident happened in Philadelphia some time ago, and the following ingenious method of locating the place of the carrier was devised by Mr. Batcheller, the engineer of the Pneumatic Tube Company: A pistol was fired at one end of the tube and its report was echoed back from the obstruction. One end of the tube was capped and had a rubber hose connection with a diaphragm, to which a stylus was attached. The pistol was fired in a hole near the capped end of the tube. To reduce the violence of the first direct wave from the explosion the rubber tube was partly closed by a stop-cock. On the discharge of the pistol the diaphragm was moved by the sound wave and the stylus recorded the movement on a recording cylinder, on which the time was also marked. The hose cock was then fully opened, and when the sound wave had traveled to the carrier and was reflected back the diaphragm was again moved and another record made. Noting the lapse of time between the direct and reflected waves and dividing it by two the time it took the sound to reach the obstruction was found, and multiplying this time by the velocity of sound the distance of the carrier from the end of the tube was determined. Breaking ground at the calculated distance the carrier was found almost at the spot determined by experiment and calculation.

Denis T. O'Sullivan, S. J.

Woodstock, Md.

Book Reviews.

STUDIES IN CHURCH HISTORY. By *Rev. Reuben Parsons, D. D.* Vol. VI. Part II. Nineteenth Century concluded. Large 8vo., pp. 722, including Topical Index to the whole work. New York: Fr. Pustet & Co.

This volume completes Doctor Parsons' great work on Church history. He has successfully brought to a close the difficult task which he set for himself in the beginning, and he is worthy of great honor for his labors. He has given to the English speaking student something which he never had before, but which he needed very much, a work which treats exhaustively and almost exclusively of controverted points of Church history. Such a work is highly interesting, not only to Catholics and Protestants, but to those who have no religious belief. The history of the Church is closely interwoven with the history of men and nations, and she bears such close relations to them that it is impossible to understand them without knowing her.

We cannot hope to learn the history of the Church from profane histories. Those who write them are generally incapable of understanding her, and through ignorance or prejudice they give us distorted views that are sadly misleading. Even if they are competent and honest they could not do justice to so vast a subject in such limited space. If we turn to Church historians proper we shall find that they give us two classes of works: One, an exhaustive treatise in some foreign language which very few persons can purchase and read, and which at best is a work of reference to be used at rare intervals to verify facts gathered from other sources; the other, a manual of Church history which is so general and so brief as to be useful only as a bird's-eye view which prepares the way for more careful study.

What was really wanted was a work on Church history which would deal at length with the great controverted questions which separate Catholics and Protestants and scandalize the unbeliever. Doctor Parsons saw this need and resolved to supply it. A less courageous man would have hesitated and declined. All history is difficult, but this branch of it is the most difficult. It would seem to be a hopeless task to try to reconcile conflicting authorities in regard to so many questions that have separated men perhaps for centuries. And it is hopeless, if one should expect to do it perfectly. Until all men shall be able to bury their prejudices, and to hold the scale of judgment with a steady hand without inclining to either side, no matter which way the scale may turn, they shall differ in

regard to questions of history. This is equivalent to saying that they shall always differ. Such perfection of judgment is not to be hoped for. Even where it does exist many other qualities are required to make it available. Much learning is necessary to fit a man for the gathering of authorities. Much patience also to enable him to persevere in spite of the many obstacles that he shall surely find in his path. With this combination, good results should follow. The historian who is well booked, who is in love with his work, who desires only the truth, who is willing to make great sacrifices that the truth may be known, and who has a cool, fair judgment, as far as imperfect man can possess such a quality, ought to write history well. Dr. Parsons is that kind of a man. These six large volumes which deal with the important questions of Church history from the beginning until the present time are a monument to his learning, zeal and industry. They are invaluable for the great majority of students, both lay and cleric, who have neither the time nor the facility to study history at the fountain head. Such persons must trust some one, and they cannot follow a safer guide than Doctor Parsons.

Not the least valuable feature of the whole work is that it is written from a Catholic standpoint. Some men imagine that in order to be fair they must cease to be Catholic. They are so anxious to win the approval of Protestant and unbelieving readers that they acknowledge evils that never existed or exaggerate them until they lose their true proportions. We do not believe that it is possible for a Catholic to write from any other standpoint than the Catholic without detracting seriously from the value of his work. A Catholic has no good reason to fear the truth, but he need not be untruthful to prove it. No one knows this better than a priest, but he need not abstract from his Catholicity or his priesthood in order to prove it to the world.

Doctor Parsons does not make this mistake, and he is to be commended. He is a historian, but he is also a Catholic priest, and he writes history from a Catholic standpoint, and therefore he writes true history.

FORSCHUNGEN ZUR CHRISTLICHEN LITTERATUR UND DOGMENGESCHICHTE. Herausgegeben von *Dr. A. Ehrhard* und *Dr. J. P. Kirsch*. Mainz, Verlag von Franz Kirchheim.

We extend a cordial welcome to this new serial, which has made its appearance from the press of Kirchheim in the historic See of St. Boniface. Its scope is clearly defined in its title, "Researches in the History of Christian Literature and Dogma." Its aim, therefore, will be to combat Rationalism and heresy with their own

weapons. The favorite weapon of attack against the Church employed by non-Catholic writers has been precisely the method of "historical inquiry." Their endeavor has been to determine at what period, and by whom, certain new dogmas were added to the "primitive simplicity" of the Christian faith. Against this theory of "accretion" the Catholic theologian opposes the doctrine of a living, active, developing, but always identical Apostolic creed. The idea of establishing a Catholic organ for the special study of Catholic literature and dogma had been separately entertained by two distinguished German divines, Dr. Ehrhard, professor of Church history in the University of Vienna, and Dr. Kirsch, the eminent patrologist and archæologist of Freiburg, in Switzerland. By a lucky chance, these two divines met and interchanged views at the Catholic Scientific Congress, held in Freiburg in 1897, and the consequence has been the founding of the new organ under their joint direction. Their names will serve as an all-sufficient guarantee of the thorough orthodoxy and efficiency of the publications which are to follow. To set the pace, Dr. Kirsch has already presented the public with the first monograph, under the title of "The Doctrine of the Communion of Saints in Christian Antiquity," which we have no hesitation in pronouncing the most exhaustive treatise on this fundamental subject which has yet appeared. We express the hope that some one will be found to translate it into English without delay. Other monographs are announced as in various stages of preparation for the press. It is the intention to issue, on the average, four each year.

JULIEN L'APOSTAT, par *Paul Allard*. Tome premier. La Société au IV. siècle. La jeunesse de Julien. Julien Cesar. Un volume in-8o. Prix: 6 fr. Librairie Victor Lecoffre, rue Bonaparte, 90, Paris.

Although above fifteen centuries have passed since the Emperor Julian made his futile attempt to check the triumphant progress of Christianity, it still remains as difficult to treat his career *nec amore et sine odio* as during the days of his despotism. The reason is that the antagonism between the principles which he sought to establish and the principles which he strove to eradicate continues as active and bitter as ever. For with Julian the struggle against "The Nazarene" was not one of brute force, as had been the case with earlier persecutors, but of statecraft and worldly wisdom. Hence he remains the immortal hero of anti-Christian writers of the school of Gibbon. On the other hand, the dread detestation in which he was held by the followers of Christ has been incorporated indissolubly in his historic appelation of "The Apostate." The dis-

tinguished author of the biography, the first volume of which lies before us, protests that he employs the usual opprobrious epithet in his title merely for the purpose of identifying the subject of his work, but without any wish to give a polemical color to the book. This life of Julian forms a fitting crown to the previous volumes of M. Allard on the subject of the early persecutions, and the studies and researches which he made in preparation for that valuable work enable him to take that comprehensive survey of the condition of society and religion in the Roman Empire in the fourth century, which occupies a full half of the present volume. To some impatient readers this preliminary essay may appear too diffuse and remote from the immediate subject under consideration; but, as M. Allard justly contends, "without a precise and detailed acquaintance with the epoch in which he lived, it would be difficult to understand rightly Julian's attempt to roll back the tide or to estimate the peculiar character of the ephemeral reaction with which his name is associated."

The volume is divided into four books, sub-divided into chapters. Book First treats of paganism in the middle of the fourth century and gives a bird's-eye view of the condition of the expiring cults in the various provinces of the Empire. Book Second unfolds the social condition of the different classes of the population, as well Christian as pagan. Then follows the narrative, in the two remaining books, of Julian's career until the year 360, when he usurped the imperial diadem. As the hero during this portion of his life most carefully dissembled his religious views, and, on the other hand, was unexcelled as a civil and military commander, there is but little to censure in his developing career, and M. Allard tells his story with fullest sympathy. We await with impatience the appearance of the concluding volume, which will treat of Julian's wretched ending; and we sincerely hope that this valuable contribution to the history of the Church will be speedily made accessible to English readers.

THE JESUIT RELATIONS AND ALLIED DOCUMENTS. Edited by Reuben Gold Thwaites, secretary of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin. Vol. LXV. Lower Canada, Mississippi Valley—1696-1702. 8 vo., pp. 273. Cleveland: The Burrows Brothers Company.

It is a remarkable characteristic of the Jesuit relations that they are always interesting. One might think that so long a narrative or series of narratives would lose its interest after the perusal of one or two volumes, but it is not so. Each succeeding volume is as intensely interesting as those that have preceded it. This is due to the constant change of scene, to the introduction of new characters

into the narrative, to the variety of persons that are constantly appearing and disappearing, and to the constant recurrence of intensely exciting incidents that produce pictures which surpass in color the imagination of the novelist. But the chief characteristic of the work, the one that renders it most valuable, and that enhances the value of all its other good qualities, is its truthfulness. No one ever thinks of questioning the veracity of the writer. His character, the simplicity of the narrative, the circumstances under which it was penned, and the end which the writer had in view, all vouch for its absolute truthfulness.

How much men of the world might learn from a work of this kind! How much of sacrifice, how much of faith, how much of confidence in a Divine Providence, without whose knowledge not even one sparrow can fall! How much also of wisdom there is here for our rulers! The greed, the lust, the general depravity of the paid agents of governments who were sent to carry civilization to distant lands and savage peoples, and who taught them new forms of vice, have their counterpart in our own day, under every powerful, conquering government. Our governors might learn many useful lessons by reading the Jesuit Relations, and they might save themselves from many serious blunders, but they won't do it. Pride of intellect is a very sad affliction, and it causes an enormous amount of misery.

These books will be placed on the shelves of libraries, where they will remain untouched and uncalled for except by the discriminating few and the real student of history who is searching for the truth. Very few men want to know the truth. Most persons want to make things fit to their preconceived notions of the truth, which self-interest induces them to hold tenaciously in spite of all evidence to the contrary.

For the true student of history and the earnest searcher after truth here is a mine of gold and gems.

ECCLESIASTICAL DICTIONARY. Containing in concise form information upon Ecclesiastical, Biblical, Archæological and Historical Subjects. By *Rev. John Thein.* Large 8vo., pp. 749. Half morocco, $5.00. New York: Benziger Brothers.

Until the year 1883 there was no Catholic Dictionary in the English language. Before that time all English works of a similar character were by Protestant authors, and while many of them were distinguished for learning and research in other respects, they were ignorant or vicious concerning Catholic subjects. We had many excellent works of the kind in other languages, but they were gen-

erally too extensive and costly for the average reader, besides being useless for the English speaking public. When Rev. William E. Addis and Mr. Thomas Arnold announced that they would supply the long-felt want of an English Catholic Dictionary, every one rejoiced.

Cardinal Manning commended the undertaking in warm terms. Cardinal Newman said that he had begun such a work himself, many years before, because the need of it was so pressing. When it came from the press, in 1883, it sprang into favor at once, and it has held the field alone since that time. It has passed through many editions both here and in England, and on the whole it is a very excellent work. It is not complete, and it was not intended to be. No dictionary or encylopedia is. No work of reference answers every demand that is made upon it, and he is a young student indeed who expects such perfection. Its treatment of some subjects was questioned, but we are not concerned with them at present. We know that on the whole it has been a very useful book, and has answered our needs in the great majority of cases.

We have said thus much by way of introduction to the new Catholic Dictionary, because we expect that those who have used the older book will want to know in what respects the new one differs from it. It is not our purpose to compare them, but to state the points of difference.

The new book is much fuller as to the number of subjects, having more than three thousand headings, whereas the old book has less than seven hundred. It is not nearly so profuse or exhaustive in its treatment as a rule, and hence it is far less satisfying. Indeed, in most cases the treatment is very brief. The language and explanations are not so clear in the later work as in the earlier, in some instances being quite halty and obscure. It is, nevertheless, a very valuable contribution to Catholic literature, and it will have, we believe, a large sale. It is excellently made. The arrangement, the paper, the type and the binding are all most commendable.

ST. FRANCIS OF SALES. By *A. De Margerie*. Translated by Margaret Maitland. With Preface by G. Tyrrell, S. J. 12mo, pp. xv., 206. Received from Benziger Brothers, New York.

It is not long since this new series of "Lives of the Saints" was begun, and yet they have appeared with such regularity that already the list embraces eight names. Some fault has been found with them by persons who do not understand the plan of action, but those who have followed the series from the beginning, and who started

out with a clear understanding of the end which the editors proposed, see that the scheme is being carried on in an admirable manner. In these very convenient little volumes we have true historical portraits of the great servants of God. They are not compilations of the pious words and actions only which are attributed to the saint, and which are built often on private tradition, but they place the whole man or woman before us as the person really lived. They show the relations which the saint bore to the persons and events of the time and place in which he lived, and therefore they furnish us with a true portrait. They are not complete finished portraits, and they differ from the more lengthy treatise as picture differs from picture, but they are complete sketches.

The other kind of biography, which is made up entirely of the pious words and actions of the subject, occupies a field peculiarly its own, and accomplishes a great deal of good when rightly understood. It shows us the perfection to which man can attain, even in this life, by the grace of God, but it may at the same time deter us from striving after such perfection unless we remember that the picture is only one-sided, and that the saints were human, and failed many times, and committed errors of judgment that some historians might call by harsher names.

The two kinds of biography, then, are good, and do not conflict with each other. Many persons will read the present series that would be repelled by more highly colored treatises. The series continues under the general editorship of M. Henri Joly, formerly Professor at the Sorbonne and at the College de France, and the English translations are revised by Rev. Father Tyrrell, S. J., who contributes a preface to each volume.

THE TESTAMENT OF IGNATIUS LOYOLA. Being "Sundry Acts of Our Father Ignatius, Taken from the Saint's own Lips by Luis Gonzales." Translated by E. M. Rix, with Preface by George Tyrrell, S. J. 12mo., pp. 230. St. Louis: B. Herder.

THE AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF ST. IGNATIUS. Edited by J. F. X. O'Conor, S. J. 12mo, pp. 166, illustrated. New York: Benziger Brothers.

It is very rarely that two different editions of the same book are published at the same time. It is the case with these two volumes. They are different translations of the same work.

The one which bears the Herder imprint is an English book. It has been translated by E. M. Rix, with a preface by Father Tyrrell, S. J., and historical notes and bibliography by Father Thurston, S. J. An amusing incident in connection with this bibliographical appendix is that in the table of contents it is called a "Biographical Appendix."

The other edition, which has been made by Benziger Brothers, is a different translation by some one not announced. It is edited by Father O'Conor, S. J., and is made up of the simple narrative without note or comment.

The work, though brief, is very valuable. Indeed, the Bollandists considered it the most valuable record of this illustrious saint. It is the groundwork of all the great lives of St. Ignatius that have been written, and without it we cannot understand him well.

The two editions should not conflict at all, because they appeal to two different classes of persons. The Herder book, being fuller and because of the valuable historical notes that accompany the text, will appeal more to the literary man and student; while the Benziger edition, being briefer, will satisfy the wants of the casual reader. It is beautifully made, and it is a delight to the eye as well as to the mind. The paper is heavy with a rich creamy surface; the type is large, clear-cut and generously spaced; and the illustrations are well executed and artistic. Even the cover is attractive, except in one particular. We mention it with the hope that the publisher will not do anything like it again. In the centre of the outside front cover there is a gaudy gold design, and in the middle of it a paper medallion of St. Ignatius. They are not artistic.

HISTORY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN THE NEW ENGLAND STATES. By Very Rev. William Byrne, D. D., William A. Leahy, A. B., Rev. James H. O'Donnell, Rev. John E. Finen, Rev. J. J. McCoy, Rev. A. Dowling, Edmund J. A. Young and Right Rev. John S. Michaud, D. D. 2 vols., large 8vo., pp. xv.-707 and xv.-895. Boston: The Hurd & Everts Co.

In these magnificent volumes we have the histories of the Church in Boston, Providence, Portland, Manchester, Hartford, Burlington and Springfield, written by men especially chosen for the purpose. It is a very important work; it is done in the ideal way. Any general history of the Church in this country must necessarily be made up of scraps of history, if it is to be made by one man. The longest life would be too short to enable a man to gather together the material that is scattered over this vast half-continent, unless he was particularly fitted for the work and unless he had untiring energy, with unlimited means and no other occupation. Such men are not found in every generation, and even when they do rise, it is not the best way to make the history of disconnected dioceses.

It is far preferable to have the history of each diocese written by its own historian, and then have them put together to form one complete history. Or, better still, as in the present instance, to have the histories of all the dioceses in an ecclesiastical province or in a

geographical section written at the same time and published in a uniform manner.

If each ecclesiastical province in the country would do what has been done in New England, and would take these volumes as their standard, following them in type, paper, size, illustrations and binding, we should have a grand history of the Church in the United States.

The Church in New England has been signally favored. From a literary point of view, as well as from the mechanical, here is a book to be proud of. The type-work and illustrations are unusually good, and altogether the work will be a lasting monument to those who conceived it and brought it to completion.

CHRISTIAN PHILOSOPHY: GOD. Being a Contribution to the Philosophy of Theism. By *Rev John T. Driscoll, S. T. L.*, author of "Christian Philosophy: a Treatise on the Human Soul." 12mo, pp. xvi., 342. New York: Benziger Brothers.

The author gives this account of the occasion which suggested and brought forth the present volume: "In 1890 a translation of Father Hettinger's Apology by Father Bowden, of the Oratory, appeared under the title of Natural Religion. The great reputation of the writer drew attention to the work. Many criticisms appeared, and of especial interest was an article on 'Reason Alone—A Reply to Father Sebastian Bowden,' in the *Fortnightly Review*, November, 1890, by W. H. Mallock. The importance of the problem was brought clearly to mind. Convinced that the existence of God was a certainty—how present this truth to the mind of the present day? This volume is the fruit of the thought and study."

Father Driscoll has adopted the comparative method in this work, because of the favorable reception which was given to his former treatise on the Human Soul, in which that method was used. Although the subject is heavy and abstruse in some parts, he has tried to render the reading as easy as possible by introducing illustrations and references to modern literature and by relegating doubts and controversies to foot notes. The author's plan is to take the idea of God as a fact of consciousness, and without stopping to enquire how the idea came to the individual mind, to ask rather, are we justified in holding the idea, and what is its content? It will be seen at once that this line of thought is a departure from that followed in most treatises on the same subject. The plan is carried with the same thoroughness and faithfulness which characterized Father Driscoll's former book, and those who study the subject under his direction will be well taught.

THEOLOGIA MORALIS DECALOGALIS ET SACRAMENTALIS. Auctore clarissimo *P. Patritio Sporer*, Ord. FF. Min. Novis curis edidit P. F. Irenæus Bierbaum, Ord. FF. Min. Tomus II. Paderbornæ, 1900. Ex Typographia Bonifaciana. PP. vii., 948. Price, marks, 7.80.

A recent moral theologian of note speaks of Sporer as highly esteemed for solidity of doctrine and practicality—*ob doctrinam plerumque solidam praxique accomodatam a plerisque magni æstimatus*. (Génicot: "Theol. Mor. Institutiones," Vol. II., p. 770, third edition.) This is a qualification of St. Liguori's estimate of Sporer as *plus quam par benignus in selegendis sententiis*. It coincides substantially with Fr. Lehmkuhl's verdict: "*Sporer generatim solide et erudite scripsit.*" To these merits Fr. Hurter's estimate adds that of perspicuity; *solide, erudite et perspicue conscripta* is his characterization of the present work. It were superfluous to add further commendation to the approbations of these eminent authorities in moral theology. It is a significant tribute to the merit of Sporer's theology that after a lapse of almost two centuries it should revive its youth in a new edition, and that the editor should find little to add or subtract in order to bring the work into adjustment with present requirements. The present volume contains the theological doctrine falling under the second five precepts of the decalogue. The gravest subjects are here treated, those namely which concern justice and injustice in their manifold species, restitution, ownership, contracts. It is a pleasure to note that the editor has done his best to facilitate the study of these perplexing subjects, by the orderly disposition of the material, whilst the publishers have seconded his efforts by the aid which typography can furnish.

BLICAL TREASURY OF THE CATHECHISM. Compiled and arranged by *Rev. Thomas E. Cox*. Second Edition. 12mo, pp. 415. New York: Wm. H. Young & Co.

One of the objections brought against the Baltimore Catechism is that it does not give quotations from the Sacred Scriptures to prove its answers. Many persons consider this omission a serious mistake. Father Fox brings forward the remedy in the volume before us. In it he reprints every question and answer in the Baltimore Catechism, and after each answer the texts of Scripture are quoted that prove or confirm the doctrine of the Catechism. By a system of cross references repetition is prevented when the same texts are to be used more than once.

It is claimed for the Biblical Treasury that it will be of great service to priests in preparing their sermons; that the seminarian will find in it abundant Scriptural proof for his theological theses; that the catechist may obtain from it thoughts to enliven every les-

son, and that the catechumen and convert may learn from it convincing testimony for the truths of Catholic faith.

The author has worked with a generous hand, and has gathered together a wealth of riches. The book bears evidence of careful compiling on every page, and it will do all that the author claims for it. It is well made and so arranged that it can be used with the smallest possible loss of time.

WETZER UND WELTE'S KIRCHEN LEXIKON. Zweite Auflage. Herder, Freiburg and St. Louis.

The revision of this great Lexicon, which has been in course of publication for fourteen years, is at length within easy distance of completion. The latest number, just received, deals with the letter V, and ends with the word *Verführung*. Within a few months, therefore, the great Catholic Lexicon will stand before us complete in twelve stately volumes, condensing the whole mass of Catholic lore, in all its departments, with such accuracy and comprehensiveness as to constitute an entire theological library in itself. Each article is the work of an expert, generally of world-wide fame, and represents the last word which contemporary science has to say on the subject under consideration. Herder's Lexicon is an honor to the Catholic Church and places Germany far in the van in the march of Catholic progress.

COMPENDIUM JURIS CANONICI, Quod in Usum Suorum Auditorum Scripsit *Andreas B. Meehan, D. D.* Rochester, 1899.

In the modest compass of 429 pages, the professor of canon law in St. Bernard's Seminary, Rochester, has given an outline of the principles and details of Church legislation which will be of interest and instruction far beyond the walls of his class room. He is generally accurate and judicial in his statements, and devoid of that captious spirit which has brought his department of theology into bad repute in many quarters. His Latin is clear and good. Referring to page 149, the canonical age for the reception of the priesthood, according to the Council of Trent, is the beginning of the twenty-*fifth* year. We hope to see the book adopted in all our seminaries.

ZUR CODIFICATION DES CANONISCHEN RECHTS. Denkschrift von *H. Laemmer*. 224 pages. 8o. Freiburg and St. Louis: Herder, 1899. Price, $1.95 net.

Among the tokens of affection received by the venerable Bishop of Ermeland on the occasion of the golden jubilee of his priesthood,

no doubt the most acceptable, as it will be the most enduring, was this excellent treatise of Laemmer on the important subject of the codification of the laws of the Catholic Church. The necessity, magnitude and difficulty of the gigantic task, and the efforts hitherto made toward the execution of it, are stated with a precision and erudition worthy of one who has aptly been styled "the Nestor of Catholic canonists."

BIBLISCHE STUDIEN. Herausgegeben von *Professor Dr. O. Bardenhewer* in München. Herder, Freiburg and St. Louis.

These "Biblical Studies" consist of valuable monographs by eminent Catholic professors under the editorial direction of Professor Bardenhewer, of Munich. The impulse to the work was given by the encyclical of Pope Leo XIII. on the Holy Scriptures, in 1893, and since its inception four volumes have appeared, each containing four separate dissertations, all masterpieces in their kind. The latest to appear is designated as opening the fifth volume of the series. It is entitled "An Excursion Through the Biblical Flora," and is the work of Rev. Leopold Fouck, S. J. Like Solomon in his last discourse on the same subject, the learned author treats of every tree and shrub, "from the cedar that is in Libanus, unto the hyssop that cometh out of the wall."

BOOKS RECEIVED.

THE LIGHT OF LIFE: Set forth in Sermons. By the *Right Rev. John Cuthbert Hedley, O. S. B.*, Bishop of Newport. 12mo, pp. 383. London: Burns & Oates. New York: Benziger Brothers.

THE FRANCISCANS IN ARIZONA. By *Rev. Zephyrin Englehardt, O. F. M.*, with a map and numerous illustrations. 8vo. Printed and published at the Holy Childhood Indian School, Harbor Springs, Michigan.

CLEMENT OF ROME, and Other Tales of the Early Church. By *Rev. John Freeland.* 12mo, pp. 187, London: Burns & Oates. New York: Benziger Brothers.

SCRIPTURE MANUALS FOR CATHOLIC SCHOOLS (arranged with a view to the Oxford and Cambridge local examinations). Edited by the Rev. Sydney F. Smith, S. J. The Gospel According to St. Matthew. By *Rev. Joseph Rickaby, S. J.* 12mo, boards, pp. 254. London: Burns & Oates. New York: Benziger Brothers.

THEOLOGIÆ MORALIS INSTITUTIONES quao in Collegio Lovaniensi Societatis Jesu tradebat Edwardus Génicot. Duo volumena, 8vo, pp. 678—872. Lovanii: Typis et Sumptibus Pollennis et Centerick. (For sale by Benziger Brothers.)

SERMONS FOR EVERY SUNDAY IN THE YEAR. By *Rev. B. J. Baycroft, A. M.* 8vo, pp. 351. New York: Fr. Pustet & Co.

THE LIFE OF ST. MARY MAGDALEN DE PAZZI. Compiled by Rev. Placido Fabrini. Translated and published by Rev. Antonio Isoleri, Missionary Apostolic. Large 8vo, pp. 469, illustrated.

GENERAL INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF THE SACRED SCRIPTURES. By *Rev. Francis E. Gigot, S. S.* 8vo, pp. 605. New York: Benziger Brothers.

HISTORY OF THE PASSION OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST. Explained by Rev. James Groenings, S. J. 8vo, pp. 315. St. Louis: B. Herder.

THE SOLDIER OF CHRIST; or, Talks Before Confirmation. By *Mother Mary Loyola*, of the Bar Convent, York. Edited by Father Thurston, S. J. 8vo, pp. 420. London: Burns & Oates. New York: Benziger Brothers.

70757

PERIODICAL

THIS BOOK MAY NOT BE
TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

DOES NOT CIRCULATE